LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Transubstantiation

A peculiar

ARTICLE

OF THE

Roman Catholick Faith,

Which was never own'd by the

Ancient Church

Or any of the

Reform'd CHURCHES,

In Answer to a late DISCOURSE call'd

Reasons for Abrogating the

TEST.

LONDON,

Printed in the Year.. 1688.

x/c
3/-
800-13

UMI

X265.3
G631t

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

I Am very unfit to enter a Conteſt of ſo high a Nature, with a Perſon, who is infinitely my Superior in all ſorts of Learning, that nothing can excuſe the Attempt from being cenſur'd as Vanity or Preſumption, but the cauſe of Wrong'd Truth, which all have indiſpenſable Obligations to Vindicate. Every thing elſe, but the Injury offer'd to that, pleas'd me in the Biſhop of Oxfords *Diſcourſe, who as he is a known Maſter of Language, Writes nothing but what is* Polite, *and Fine, and adorns that Learning which he poſſeſſes in a high degree, with all the charming Beauties of Eloquence. I hope I have preſerv'd for him that Reſpect, which I owe to his Dignity, as well as to his Worth. If any thing made me forget my ſelf, and him, it was ſome little Indignation, to read with what* Contempt *he treated two* Perſons, *for whom I have deſervedly a high Veneration. This rais'd ſome Spleen, which made me ſmile a little in Diſdain; and if then there hath dropt an unbecoming word, the Humour I was in, pleads for my* Pardon.

Perhaps now thou expecteſt ſome wiſe and weighty Anſwer unto the Reaſons for Abrogating the TEST; But

1054483

it becomes not me to Jugde of what are Affairs of the State; and therefore I wholly wav'd that Conſideration. Wherein our common Reform'd Religion is concern'd, there I have Intereſted my ſelf, and as it hath been Attaqu'd in two ſeveral places, 'tis only the firſt I have now ſtood to Guard; The other part, which is to Maintain the charge of Idolatry againſt the Worſhip of the Roman Church, *may make me venture a ſecond time, if ſome abler* Pen *than mine, is not provok'd to draw in the Quarrel. And now all the Favour I ask of thee, as ſome Recompence for ſo much Time which I have ſpent to give thee an hours Entertainment, is, that thou wouldeſt not enquire after the Name of a Man, who is very Inconſiderable; and who beſides, aſſures thee, that it will be in vain, ſince he hath us'd ſufficient care and precaution, never to be known.*

Tranſub-

Tranſubſtantiation

A peculiar

ARTICLE

OF THE

Roman Catholick Faith,

In Anſwer to a late DISCOURSE call'd

Reaſons for Abrogating the TEST.

I Have ſo little ambition to appear in any of the Diſputes, which have created ſo many Quarrels among Chriſtians, as I wiſh with all my Soul, that they who are call'd by that glorious Name, perfectly agreed in thoſe Truths which were the Faith of the Apoſtles and the pureſt Ages of the Primitive Church. How Bleſſed would the Church of Chriſt have been in an undiſturb'd Peace, if all the Errors, which firſt corrupted our Religion, had been ſtifled in their Birth, and ſo never impos'd by the Canons of pretended Councils as Articles of our Creed. But Intereſt firſt engag'd ſome Men to offer incredible Things unto the People to be believed, and they took the firſt opportunities to vent them in Times of ſuch Darkneſs, that the poor people were blind, and ſo eaſily miſled; and to tye the Muffler about their Eyes ſo faſt, that it might never be unloos'd; the name of the *Catholick Church* was ſtill made uſe of to Authorize ſtrange Opinions

which ſhe never own'd; and to ſecure her Authority from ever being queſtion'd, the pretence of Infallibility was Impregnable. Now leaſt any more Inquiſitive, than the reſt of the Herd, ſhould ſtartle at the ſight of what was new, and unſeen before the noiſe of Antiquity was ſufficient to ſilence all their queſtions; and in an ignorant Age, when few or none of thoſe who were diſintereſted had wit enough to Judge of what was in preſent view, much leſs to look back with a diſcerning Eye on what was paſt at a far diſtance, the plauſible Story could not eaſily be diſprov'd.

Thus the Worſhiping of Images firſt ſtole out into the World, and not long after, the Doctrine of Chriſts Bodily Preſence in the Sacrament, was Incourag'd to the Birth.

As long as People were dull enough to give an undoubted aſſent to all that their Prieſts told them, and were ſtrongly prepar'd to ſwallow the hugeſt Contradictions, they all went down ſmoothly; But as Knowledge increas'd with the dawning of the Goſpel, thoſe groſs Abſurdities were diſcover'd in many things, (which the People had believ'd without ever examining them, and which the Darkneſs of preceding Ages had conceal'd) that it was neceſſary to give things a fairer appearance, to call them by ſofter Names, that they might both look and ſound leſs affrighting. This is the Artifice which is now ſo much us'd and applauded by the Church of *Rome*, who it muſt be acknowledg'd, never wanted Addreſs to diſentangle her ſelf, when her Errors are ſo expos'd that they are no longer defenſible; and then the ſureſt way to avoid the Blow, is to confound them with the contrary Truths, that her Doctrine may be as unknown as her own firſt Original. And indeed the beſt means to eſcape a Confutation, is to caſt ſuch a miſt before our Eyes, as we cannot apprehend what it is ſhe believes. In one Age, Tranſubſtantiation is neceſſary to be believed to Salvation; now 'tis ſo indifferent, as 'tis diſavow'd, that the Church ever appointed it an Article of Faith, or ever aſſign'd the Modus (pardon a word which I have but borrow'd) of the Real Preſence; and thus a point ſo dear, and which not Two hundred Years paſt, coſt the Blood of ſo many Martyrs, becauſe they would not own their belief of it, is vaniſhed in the miſts of the Schools, and utterly loſt in the

the Duſt rais'd by the Diſputes of *Aquinas*, *Scotus*, and their Followers.

But the Author, who thus makes a new Creed for that Church, is too young a Proſelyte to Comment on the Articles of her Faith, and one ſo lately initiated into the Holy Rites, may with good reaſon have his deciſions ſuſpected, as not being grounded on a ſufficient knowledge in the Myſteries of her Religion.

I know not how thoſe who belong to that Comminion will reſent it, but it hath a very odd Aſpect, that the Holy Catholick Church ſhould be drawn ſo, as to reſemble the Hereticks in the neareſt likeneſs as her Picture can be taken. It intrenches on her Infallibility, to reconcile the principal parts of her Doctrine with ſuch Articles as ſhe always condem'd of Hereſie; and which, as the moſt damnable Hereſie, ſhe hath continually and moſt fiercely oppos'd. It was for *Tranſubſtantiation* the great Heat began with *Luther*, though ſome other leſſer matters firſt rais'd a Quarrel. This in its niceſt Explications hath ſtill been the Subject of the warmeſt Diſputes. It was for this ſo many ſuffer'd as obſtinate Hereticks, not fit to live, becauſe they had liv'd too long to renounce the uſe of all their Senſes and Reaſon in believing an open contradiction to them all. And yet now the cauſe of ſo many Diſputes, Quarrels, and Blood, is cleverly convey'd away, and ſo many have flam'd at a Stake, and the ground been dyed with the Blood of ſlaughter'd Multitudes, only for ſome Niceties of the Schools. For if we will truſt our Author's bare word, no Councils of the *Roman Church* have ever defin'd the manner of Chriſt's Real Preſence in the Euchariſt, but left it to be wrangled out by Logicians and Sophiſters, as they could beſt clear it by the Principles of *Ariſtotle*'s Philoſophy. Now it was the manner of that Preſence which always kindled both the Zeal of that Church, and the Fires which conſum'd Hereticks, who by conſequence ſuffer'd not as Apoſtates from the Faith, but the Doctrines of the Infallible Stagyrite. This is to make the *Roman* Religion moſt barbarouſly cruel, in Burning and Damning Men merely as Hereticks in Philoſophy; but though thoſe who profeſs it are but little engag'd to him for repreſenting it ſo odious;

yet

yet he has extraordinarily oblig'd all the Proteſtants, by creating them on a ſudden true Sons of the *Roman* Catholick Church; we will now hope not only to be Sav'd our ſelves, but that all, who before us own'd the ſame Doctrines as we do, are in a very good condition, ſince he comprehends both us and them within her Boſome who appropriates to her ſelf the Keys, and diſpoſal of Heaven. We are all now of one Faith, and the Confeſſions of all the Proteſtant Churches exactly agree with the Deciſions of the Great Council of *Trent*. They Aſſert the Real Preſence, that Council, as our Author will have it, Determines no more; and how unreaſonable then is it to make a Teſt to diſtinguiſh between *Roman* Catholicks and us, when we all believe the ſame thing. But however he boldly charges all the Wiſdom and Authority of the Nation with a moſt ridiculous Impertinence, in forming a Teſt for the *Roman* Catholicks, which does not concern any point of their Faith, yet *Tranſubſtantiation* was once a very good Teſt for the Hereticks; and time was, when their ſaying in general Terms, that they believed the Real Preſence, was not ſufficient to ſave them from the Fire. There muſt certainly be ſomething more in the buſineſs, which our Author would not ſee, and the reconciliation is too new, and eaſie not to be ſuſpected, nor can I ever imagine that the Church of *Rome* will admit us into her Communion upon ſuch facile conditions.

It will then be worth while to Enquire into the Reaſons which led him into an Opinion, wherein he is alone, and which (for all that I know to the contrary,) he may always boaſt as peculiarly his own. What is the Ground of his Aſſertion which is altogether ſo Extraordinary? Why! Truly a harmleſs Word lay in his way, as he was haſtily running through ſome Authors, at which he unfortunately ſtumbled.

It is very well known, that in moſt of the Books, that are written on this Subject, *Chriſt* is affirmed to be really preſent in the Bread and Wine; and where ever our Author has met with this Real Preſence, whether in the *Auguſtan*, or *Bohemian* Confeſſions; or in *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, *Beza*, or *Calvin*, he fancy'd he ſaw the Body and Blood of

of our Bleſſed *Saviour* in its full and true Proportion. This Fancy of his own, he hopes to perſwade others to believe, though all the Arguments he urges, is only by playing with an Ambiguity impos'd on an honeſt plain-meaning Word.

To unravel therefore that confus'd heap of Citations, which ſwell up ſo many Pages, it will be neceſſary to Explain

1. In what Senſe our great Redeemer is preſent to us in the Sacrament.

2. And then Secondly, It will be apparent, that all the Fathers of the Primitive Church, and all the Writers of latter Ages, till the Eigth Century was almoſt run out, never drop'd a word that can tempt us to think that they believed *Chriſt* to be ſubſtantially preſent in the Sacrament; However, they frequently may aſſert, That he is really preſent, and exhibited to our Souls in the Elements of Bread and Wine: So far were they from confounding the Real Preſence with the Subſtantial, of *Chriſt*'s Body in its natural way of Exiſtence, as our Author does.

And in the Hiſtory, which by his Example I ſhall give, it will alſo be manifeſt, that the Opinion of the Subſtantial Preſence never entred into the *Weſtern Church*, till *Paſchaſius Robertus* firſt Invented it, who firſt made an Innovation in this Faith.

3. And then Thirdly, I ſhall prove that this New Opinion was at laſt adopted into the Faith of the Apoſtatiz'd Church of *Rome*, who in ſeveral Councils have not only confirmed it, but choſe the very Word *Tranſubſtantiation*, as moſt proper to expreſs it.

4. I will Evidence, that the Confeſſions of the *Proteſtant Churches*, who our Author Cites, and their Writers, both Foreign, and of the Church of *England*, though they expreſs their Faith of the Real Preſence, yet they mean it in a different Senſe, from that which is determined by the *Roman* Church.

Firſt, To clear it, that the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* may be Really preſent in the Bread and Wine, and yet not Subſtantially, an Enquiry will be needful into the End, for which our Bleſſed Lord appointed and commanded the Celebration of

this Holy Myſtery; and if he is preſent to us in it, ſo as perfectly to ſatisfie the Deſign of his Inſtitution, his Body and Blood are there in the greateſt reality that can anſwer our *Saviour*'s purpoſe, though not in their real Natures.

It was not to benefit our Bodies, but our Souls, that he Inſtituted this and all other Ordinances. He did not intend herein a Character of Honour to our Fleſhly part, in conferring a priviledge of handling him. How poor a favour would this be to any real purpoſes of our happineſs? If we could ſuppoſe that he ſtill lived among Men, ſo that we might not only touch his Sacred Body, but ſee it in the moſt Glorious appearance, which is more than the greateſt Viſionaries of the *Roman* Church will pretend, and quite contrary to what their Natural preſence of his Body in their Sacrament entertains them with, where they do not, nor ever did ſee it, but only the Bread and Wine. If *Chriſt* were thus in his Humane Nature, the Object of all our Senſes at once, what benefit in this particular ſhould we enjoy more than what the wickedeſt Wretch living would equally ſhare? We ſhould be no more bleſſed barely in this reſpect, than the multitude who crowded upon him; Than *Judas*, who kiſſed and betrayed him; Than the Soldiers who crowned him with Thornes and cloathed him in the mock Robes of a King; Than that Ring of an Impious Rabbel, who were Spectators of his being Crucified, and triumph'd in his Death. Nay, if we could renounce our Senſes and Reaſon ſo far as to believe his Body Naturally preſent in the Sacrament, and that we receiv'd the very Subſtance of it into ours, and we could really think that we did ſo uncouth a thing, as to eat it, when by ſight and taſte we eat Bread: Yet how vain would this be to any real end of our Salvation, when as the greateſt Villain, who has but a Mouth wide enough to take in the Conſecrated Wafer, is as well a Partaker of *Chriſt*'s Body in this ſenſe, as the moſt Holy-diſpoſed Soul. Thus inſignificant would the Real ſubſtantial preſence of *Chriſt*'s Body and Blood, in the Sacrament, be to us, ſince he hath told us himſelf too, *That the Fleſh profitteth nothing*: And therefore, if we will believe him, on his own Word, we cannot imagine he offers himſelf in that way, unleſs we can think, that when he intended us the greateſt priviledge of his Goſpel, and which ſhould do

us

us the moſt good, he would order the matter ſo, as in effect it ſhould do us no good at all. We may then be ſure of this, that however otherwiſe he meant to be preſent to us in this holy Supper, he never deſign'd to be there Corporally, that we might put him into our Mouths; and I am very apt to think, that when he aſcended to Heaven, he never thought to remove thence again, only to be carried about the Streets and ſhewn.

Our *Saviour* then does not give his Body to nouriſh ours, nor pours out his Blood to be transfus'd into our Veins; both his Body and Blood are preſented to us in the Bread and Wine, to profit our Souls; and therefore the Preſence of them in thoſe Elements, muſt be ſuitable to ſuch Beings as our Spirits, and in a way proper to diſtribute into them, their Gracious Influences and Effects: It muſt be Real, but Spiritual; It is Spiritual, that is not Bodily: For what would that concern the benefit of our Souls, which are no more capable of a Corporeal good, than our Bodies can be nouriſh'd by the knowledge of things? It is Spiritual, that it may be ſuitable to the Operations of our Spirits, whoſe refin'd Nature makes the Subſtantial preſence of a thing unneceſſary to place it before them, and when I think of any Object, though paſt, or far diſtant, it is as really in the view of my mind, as what I ſee juſt at my Elbow.

The Body and Blood of *Chriſt* then, as repreſented in the Signs, the Bread and the Wine, are as really preſent to our Faith contemplating them, as any thing can be preſent to the acts of our Minds. And the outward ſigns themſelves are not more truly before our Eyes, than the things ſignifi'd are before our Thoughts, which upon the notice which the Sign gives, inſtantly view and conſider, what 'tis ordain'd to repreſent. And Faith, which acts the greateſt part in making us Partakers of the Genuine bleſſings of this Sacrament, hath in the Word of God this Office appointed to it, that it realizes, or makes preſent to us, things that are far diſtant. It is call'd *the Subſtance of Things hoped for, and the Evidence of Things not ſeen*; what is deſcry'd in a far Proſpect by our Hopes, Faith brings ſo near, that it ſets them before us, as if we held them in our hands and ſolidly poſſeſs'd them. *Heb.* 11. 1.

And therefore *Chriſt*'s Body and Blood, are not merely brought to our remembrance by the outward Signs, as Figures of them, but with them are deliver'd to us, to all the intents and purpoſes wherein they can do us good. Thus in receiving the Bread and Wine, we receive *Chriſt*'s Body and Blood too, as far as they can be given into our poſſeſſion ; and *Chriſt* deſign'd them for us. We have all, for which that Body was broken, and his Blood pour'd out, the pardon of Sin, and Peace, and Reconciliation with an offended God, and his favour confirm'd to us. And therefore we really receive that Body and Blood, ſince we effectually receive them to all their gracious Ends. And what real Preſence of them can we deſire more? I am certain this is as much as can be truly beneficial to our Souls, and the Sacrament aims at nothing farther.

Nor are we to think that the bleſſed Effects only of *Chriſt*'s Body and Blood are preſented to us with the Elements, which *Chriſt* has therefore inſtituted in Signs and Seals of this unvaluable Gift : But all gracious Influences are communicated to us, our Grace increas'd, and ſpiritual Strength improv'd, and the heavenly Life ſupplyed with freſh force and vigour. This is the bleſſed Efficacy of *Chriſt*'s Body and Blood, which as really are preſent in the Sacrament to nouriſh and ſanctifie our Souls, as the Bread and Wine are to feed and refreſh our Bodies.

Thus *Chriſt* is really preſent in the Sacrament, that is, Spiritually ſo unto our Souls in ſuch a manner, as is moſt effectual to Influence and Bleſs them, and yet he is not there in his Natural Being. So that according to this Explication of it, there will be vaſt difference between his Real and Subſtantial Preſence : And all the Authors which are Cited, as Aſſerting both ; yet all they indeed expreſs, is only this, That *Chriſt* is Truly and Really Preſent in the Sacrament : Which they might very well affirm in the Senſe I have given, and yet never have a thought of his being Subſtantially there.

I could

I could not but wonder to find it affirm'd, with so great Assurance, and bold Appeal, to all *that are but ordinarily Conversant in Ecclesiastical Learning, That the Ancient Fathers from Age to Age, Asserted the Real and Substantial Presence, in very high and Expressive Terms.* And yet all that is brought to prove it, is nothing but the bare mention of some *Greek* and *Latine* words, which are of a very general and doubtful Signification, and may be applyed to a hundred things sooner than to what they are made to design. If it were in an Age like that of which *Erasmus* gives so pleasant a Character; That it was so devoutly Ignorant, as it was accounted a Heresie to understand *Greek*; then no Man could know but these hard Words might be unanswerable Arguments: but now the Sense of them is easie enough to be found out, that they Import nothing to the present purpose, and that they do not at all mean the Real and Substantial Presence, as the Author Translates them.

Reasons for Abrogating the *Test*, pag. 13. *1st. Ed.*

And as easie it is to clear the Ancient Fathers from what he would Impose on them; and to prove that they are so far from asserting the Real and Substantial Presence in High and Expressive Terms, that there is not the least Expression in any of them to favour that Opinion. And though indeed they say that *Christ* is Really present in the Bread and Wine, and they phrase it often in Magnificent and flourishing words; yet they mean it in the Sacramental and Spiritual sense, not the Natural manner of Being.

It will be unnecessary, after the great Volumes which have been writ to this purpose, to swell these few Sheets with numerous Citations: I shall only select some few that will more nearly concern the present Debate.

If the Fathers call the Elements of Bread and Wine, the Types, or Figures, or Signs of *Christ*'s Body and Blood; it will unavoidably follow, that they never understood any other Real Presence of them, than such as is Attributed to the Thing signifi'd, when it is offer'd and exhibited to our Minds by the Sign which denotes it; and therefore are not Substantially there, but only in a clear and lively representation to our Faith.

Faith. And yet nothing is more common in their Writings than such Expressions, *Tertullian* against *Marcion*, speaks clearly to this purpose in so many words, [a] *That Jesus Christ made the Bread his Body, in saying, This is my Body; that is to say, the Figure of my Body. And* [b] *that our Lord put on the Bread, the Figure of his Body.* And St. *Augustin* calls it a Sign, in these words; [c] *Our Lord did not scruple to say, This is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body.*

[a] *Tertullian, contra Marcionem, Lib.* 4. c. 40.
[b] *Ibid. L.* 3. c. 19.
[c] *Augustin contra Adimant.* c. 12. *Tom.* 6. *Oper. Fol.* 48. *Paris.* 1571.

Eusebius Bishop of *Cæsarea*, speaks plainly the same Language, such a Harmond was there, not only in their Faith, but their Tongues. [d] *He himself* (speaking of our Lord Jesus Christ) *deliver'd to his Disciples, the Symbols of the Divine Dispensation; Exhorting them to represent the Image of his Body.* And in what they were to do it, he explains at but two Lines distance. *He prescrib'd to them, that they should use the Bread as the Symbol of his Body.*

[d] *Euseb. Demon. Evang. L.* 8. *p.* 380. *Ed. Paris.* 1628

It will not be improper to add a Testimony to the same purpose out of the Liturgy of St. *Basil*, especially since the Author of the *Reasons, &c.* lays a great Weight on this Prayer us'd in the *Greek* form of Consecration. *Make this Bread the Precious Body of thy Christ; and that which is in this Cup, the Precious Blood of thy Christ: which Words are taken out of the Liturgies of St.* Chrysostom *and St.* Basil. And if they are, they must not be understood as he would have them, unless he will allow a greater Contradiction in the Liturgy it self; where in the Prayer which the Priest makes just before the Consecration, there are these Words: *He left to us the Monuments of his Passion that Saves us, even these which by his Command, we now set before you.* And the same he calls after the Consecration, *The Antitypes of the Holy Body and Blood of Christ.* But how could the Bread and Wine be the Types, or Signs, or Images of *Christ*'s Body and Blood, if they were chang'd into their Substance, and so became one and the same thing with them?

Pag. 33.

Καταλιπὼν ἡμῖν ὑπομνήματα τῶν σωτηρίων αὐτοῦ παθημάτων ταῦτα, ἃ προτεθείκαμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολάς.

Τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

It will not be improper to add one Testimony more, which coming from one of the *Popes*, carries with it the greater Authority, and must claim Credit on the score of Infallibity. It is *Gelasius*, who lived about the end of the Fifth Century, who

who ſpeaks like as a rank Sacramentarian, as *Peter Martyr* or any of them all. *Certainly* (ſays he) *the Sacraments which we take of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, are a Divine Thing, for which reaſon we by them are made partakers of a Divine Nature, and yet it ceaſeth not to be the Subſtance or Nature of Bread and Wine. And certainly the Image and likeneſs of Chriſt's Body and Blood are celebrated in the Action of theſe Myſteries.* *Gelaſius de duabus nat. in Chriſto in Biblioth. Patr. 2. Tom. 4. p. 522. Ed. 3. Binii.*

And theſe Inſtances are a ſure and ſufficient Evidence, that the Ancient Fathers never appropriated any thing elſe to the Bread and Wine but the ſigns of Chriſts Body and Blood, and therefore could underſtand no more Real Preſence than what agrees to a Thing as repreſented by its ſign.

And to our receiving that Body, and that Blood, together with the outward Elements, they meant no more by it, than that all the Heavenly Influences, Spiritual Bleſſings, and Effects of Chriſt's Body and Blood, are Communicated and confirm'd to us in this Sacrament; I will produce two or three Witneſſes to prove it, and the firſt ſhall be St. *Cyprian*, who in his Diſcourſe of the Lords Supper, thus expreſſeth himſelf: *An Immortal Nouriſhment is given different from common Food retaining the Appearance of Corporal Subſtance, but by an Inviſible Efficacy manifeſting the preſence of the Divine Power.* And he further Explains his meaning in theſe words. *That common Bread chang'd into Fleſh and Blood, procures Life and Growth to our Bodies, and therefore by this uſual Effect of things, the weakneſs of our Faith being help'd, is taught by a ſenſible Argument, that the Effect of Eternal Life is in the viſible Sacraments.* Agreeable to this, is what Saint *Auſtin* ſays in his Comment on the 98th *Pſalm*, where he introduces our Saviour to remove the offence which his Diſciples had taken at his Words in *John* 6. 53. thus ſpeaking to them, *You are not to eat this Body which you ſee, nor to drink that Blood, which thoſe who will Crucifie me, ſhall ſhed; I have commended a certain Sacrament to you, which Spiritually underſtood, will give you Life.* *S. Cyprianus de cœna Domini.*

I Will

I will mention but two more, the first shall be St. *Ambrose*, who speaking of the Sacrament hath these Words. *The Substance of the Bread is not taken away, but the Grace of the Body of Christ is superadded to the Bread, and thence it hath the Name of that Body given to it.* By the Grace of Christ's Body, nothing else can be meant, but all the gracious Effects and Blessings which are procur'd to us by his Death and Blood, and which the Bread and Wine exhibit and present to us.

Lib. 4. de Sacramentis.

The next shall be St. *Chrysostome*, who expresly refutes our eating Christs Body in the Natural Substance of it. *Mysteries* (says he) *are not Carnally, but with our inward Eyes, that is Spiritually to be considered and contemplated, for this is the nature of Mysteries.* And a little after. *As in Baptism, by the sensible Element of Water, the intelligible gift of Regeneration is conferr'd, so this Intelligible gift of the Body and Blood of Christ, is not perceiv'd by any Corporeal, or sensible Action, but by the Spiritual understanding of Faith in the Soul and Mind.*

Homil. 45. In S. Joh.

Now these Expressions are so clear, that the sense of them may be discern'd at first sight, and therefore can more surely direct us to a full and plain understanding of the Mind of the Fathers, than Metaphors and Figures of Eloquence, or than general ambiguous Phrases, which may promiscuously be applyed to signifie an hundred different Things. It is indeed very well known, that they often express themselves in high and glorious Terms; but we are to reflect upon the fair occasion that they had to do so, and on what was their design. It was an Early and Just Complaint in the Church, that many of those who were admitted to the participation of this Holy Mystery, had too slight Thoughts of it, and did not approach it with a becoming Reverence. They had not an awful sense, and therefore receiv'd the Sacrament as if they eat only Common Bread and Wine; The ordinary Entertainments of a Love Feast, and the tyes of Christian Charity and Fellowship, for so was Eating together accounted among the Ancients. Of this the Apostle gives us a large account in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, & grievously complains; and writes, not only with the greatest earnestness, but in the highest Language could be used, to alarm them with the danger of their stupid negligence. He therefore roundly tells them, that they were guilty of Profaneness towards the Body and Blood of Christ, and so eat and drunk Damnation, because they discern'd not the Lord's Body.

1 Cor. 11. V. 27, 28, 29.

Because

Becauſe they took the Bread and Wine without regard to the ſacred Inſtitution, not looking on them as the Symbols which *Chriſt* had appointed to repreſent his Body and his Blood, and ſo were guilty of neglecting them, becauſe they did not by Faith ſee them ſpiritually exhibited in the outward Signs. And to the ſame intent he ſpeaks ſo glorioufly of this Ordinance in the preceding Chapter, where he honours the Bread and Wine which went round the holy Aſſembly with no lower Title, than the Communion of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*: That ſo they might not have ſuch poor Apprehenſions of this Bleſſed Feaſt, that in it they Eat and Drank together, only as the Bond and Token of Chriſtian Communion; but they ought to penetrate the receſſes of this glorious Myſtery, and diſcern the ineſtimable Bleſſing unſeen and cover'd under it. They had not meerly Communion one with another in Aſſembling to Eat together, but they Communicated in the ſame Body of Chriſt, ſince all the Effects, Influences, and Efficacy of his Body and Blood was diſtributed with the Bread and Wine to every Holy Soul in the Aſſembly, who worthily receiv'd. Such high and magnificent words did the Apoſtle think neceſſary, which by applying all the Glory and Majeſty of the Things ſignified to the Signs, might procure it due Veneration. By the ſame proportion we are to meaſure the intended meaning of the Fathers, when they ſay, that the Bread and Wine, are Chang'd, Transform'd, Tranſelemented, *&c.* into the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*. They thought they could not ſpeak too Loftily on this Subject, to advance its Dignity; and therefore employ'd all the Flouriſhes of Eloquence, of which they were great Maſters, to deſcribe it to the People in the moſt Glorious and Heavenly Shape it could be drawn. They deſign'd to raiſe the thoughts of the Communicants, to conſider there was a great deal more in this ſolemn act of their Religion, than what was barely offer'd to their ſenſe; and that the viſible matter of the Sacrament was not vain and empty Signs, but as Inſtituted and Commanded by our Lord *Chriſt*, were follow'd with his Bleſſings, and accompanied with the Life and Spirits of his Body and Blood to all gracious purpoſes.

Chap. 10. *v.*

And on this account, as our *Saviour* himſelf did not, ſo neither did they make any difficulty to honour the Bread with the name of his Body: Nay, ſometimes in the heat and rapture of their Zeal, to inflame Peoples Affections, and warm their Devotions, they would uſe the moſt high and expreſſive Terms.

The *Greek* Fathers, thoſe of Μεταβολὴ, Μεταῤῥύθμισις, Μετασκευασμὸς, Μέταποίησις, Μεταστοιχείωσις. And the *Latines* agreeable with the *Greeks*, *Converſion*, *Tranſmutation*, *Transformation*, *Transfiguration*, Reaſons for Abrogating, pag. 23.

figuration, *Tranſelementation*, (*Tranſubſtantiation* only excepted, which the Author of the Reaſons, *&c.* puts in among the reſt, and yet it is not to be found in any of the Ancients,) by all which they expreſs'd nothing leſs than the Real and Subſtantial Preſence in the Euchariſt, unleſs he will faſten ſo Invidious a Character on the Fathers of the Church, as to accuſe them of Writing againſt themſelves. And contradict themſelves they muſt, if thoſe Words of theirs are Explain'd of the converſion of the ſubſtance of the Bread, (and any other change beſides Subſtantial will ſignify nothing to the purpoſe) into the Subſtance of Chriſt's Body. For nothing can be more contrary than ſuch a real Converſion to all their other Expreſſions concerning the Supper of our Lord, wherein they call the Bread and Wine, Signs and Figures of Chriſt's Body and Blood; of which I have before given ſome few, when I might have innumerable Inſtances.

But what tho the Fathers never explain'd themſelves in any other than theſe Words, which the Author Aſſigns as a valid proof, that they believed the Real Subſtantial Preſence, yet from Words which are of ſo doubtful a ſound, no Argument can be form'd to make it good, unleſs it could be prov'd they were determin'd to ſignify a change of Subſtance, and could Import nothing leſs. And for this I dare Appeal to him, or any other, to produce a Sentence out of any of the Fathers, or any other Authors of Fame for the Propriety of thoſe two Languages, wherein any of theſe Words are accepted in that peculiar meaning he is pleas'd to put upon them.

And yet I will give ſeveral Inſtances as well out of the Fathers, as prophane Writers, that theſe words are made uſe of to expreſs ſuch Things, wherein it would be perfect Non-ſenſe to underſtand any Change of their Being or Subſtance.

Suidas in voce μεταβολὴ.

And firſt for the Word μεταβολὴ, if we may believe *Suidas*, it ſignifies in general all Change whatever, as well in Quantity, Quality, and Place as Subſtance, and ſo may be indifferently us'd in reſpect of them all. And accordingly *Gregory Nyſſen.* expreſſeth by it the Change that is wrought in us in Regeneration, and what paſſeth on us by Baptiſm, which no Man will ſay moulds us into a new Subſtance.

Greg. Nyſſen. Orat. Catech. Tom. 3. p. 108. Τὸ ὅτι ἀναγκαίως καὶ διὰ τῆς μεταβολῆς τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν τὴν σωτήριον παραλαμβάνεσθαι γένεσιν παντὶ δῆλόν ἐστι & paulo poſt ἡ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος πρὸς τὸ κρεῖττον μεταβολή.

Nor will the next Words ſerve his Deſign more ſucceſsfully. For μεταῤῥύθμισις, means no more than the Reformation, or Amendment of a Thing. Thus *Xenophon* introduces the Maſter of a Family viſiting his Servants in their ſeveral Employments in the Fields,

Xenophon Oeconom. pag. 495. Opt. Ed. Gr. *H. Steph.* Μεταῤῥυθμίζω ἐὰν ἔχω τι βέλτιον, τοῦ παρόντος.

Fields, and having diligently ſurveyed them all, ſays he, *if I ſee any thing that I judg may be better done, I amend it.* And in the ſame ſenſe *Ariſtotle* uſes the Word, ſpeaking of reclaiming the vicious from a lewd courſe of Life, who were acted only by Paſſion, or Pleaſure, and ſuch, ſays he, *what Reaſon can correct or reform.* And *Clemens Alexandrinus* when he ſays, *That Learning doth adorn and accompliſh a Man by the Improvement of his Nature*, expreſſeth it by the ſame Word. And yet all this is done without metamorphoſing a Man into ſome other Creature.

Ariſt. de Moribus. lib. 10. Tom. 3. Op. *pag.* 186. Ed. Duvallii, Τοὺς δὴ τοιούτους τὴς ἄν λόγος μεταρρυθμίσαι.

Clemens Alexandr. Strom. lib. 4. *p.* 534. Ed. Paris 1629. Κὶ γὰρ ἡ διδαχὴ μεταῤῥυθμίζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

But let us try what the other μετασκευασμὸς will do for the cauſe. It properly ſignifies to make a thing change its place: But it is us'd by *Seneſius* to expreſs the alteration of a State, or courſe of Life, and yet a Man may paſs from one place to another, or alter his way of living, and continue the ſame unchang'd in his Being, μεταποίησις ſignifies the Change of a thing too, but ſuch as may well be together with the ſameneſs of its Subſtance. Since *Juſtin Martyr* makes this word to explain the Reſtoration of all things at the laſt day of the World, which yet he never could imagine would be turned into a new one for Subſtance. And *Gregory Niſſen.* has the ſame Word to expreſs the Change of our Life after Regeneration.

Syneſius in Epiſt. *pag.* 58. Edit. Gr. Turnebi. Κάιτος τις οὐκ οἶδεν ὅτι καὶ τοὺς φύσει στρατιοτικῶς ἔχοντας τῶν ἀρχόντων μεταδιδάσκουσι καὶ μετασκευάζουσιν εἰς ἐμπόρους.

Juſtin Martyr Quæſt. 1. ad Græcos. Θεὸς τὸν ὑρανὸν ἔταξε τῷ οἰκείῳ ὅσῳ ἐν ἀφθασίᾳ διαμένειν ἕως τοῦ καιροῦ τῶν ὄντων εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον μεταποίησεως κατὰ τὴν πίστιν τῶν ὀρθοδόξων.

Greg. Nyſſen. Orat. Catech. Tom. 3. *p.* 108. Ἡ διὼ τῆς ἀναγεννησεως γινομένη τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῖν μεταποίησις, οὐκ ἂν εἴη μεταποίησις εἰ ἐν ᾧ ἔσμεν διαμένοιμεν.

The great Conteſt is for the next Word Μηταστοιχείωσις, which according to *Suidas* is the turning of any thing into another Figure and Shape, and if we take this Signification of it from him, it will do very little good in the preſent caſe, ſince the moſt zealous Aſſertors of the real Subſtantial Preſence, were never yet ſo abandon'd of Senſe, as to ſay that the Figure of the Bread is chang'd into that of Chriſt's Body, ſince the Figure is one of the Accidents of Bread and Wine, which they affirm to remain after the Conſecration. But if we ſhould ſuffer the word to be rendred as the Author pleaſes, to ſignify Tranſelementation, yet even thus it could never ſignify a Converſion of one Subſtance into another; unleſs he will ſay, that we are tranſubſtantiated

Suidas in voce μεταστοιχειοῦσα.

 when

when our Natures are renewed by Grace: For *Cyril* of *Alexandria* expreſſes it by this word. And if *Gregory Nyſſen.* and *Theophilact* uſe the term μεταστοιχείωσις with reſpect to the Bread and Wine, they muſt yet mean by it ſome other Change, than that of Subſtance. For it will hardly be acknowledg'd, that the Water in the other Sacraments of Baptiſm is tranſubſtantiated, yet this Phraſe μεταστοιχείωσις is as well brought in by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, when he ſpeaks of the Waters of Baptiſm, as it is by *Nyſſen* and *Theophilact* in diſcourſing concerning the Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt, and if it muſt expreſs a ſubſtantial Converſion of the Elements in one Sacrament, with equal Reaſon it muſt import the ſame in the other. But if it is granted that all the Change of the Baptiſmal Water is only as to its deſignation to a holy Uſe and Bleſſing, then neither will there be any other alteration of the Sacramental Bread and Wine, than their being conſecrated to a peculiar and ſacred uſe, ſo that they are no longer common things, but hallowed by our Lord's Inſtitution.

Cyril Alexandr. de Adorat. *lib.* 17. Ὁ (ſc. Chriſtus) πάντα πρὸς καινότητα μεταστοιχειῶν.

Cyril Alexand. in Joh. 3. in Catenâ διὰ τῆς πνευματικῆς ἐνεργείας τὸ ἀΐδιον ὕδωρ πρὸς ἁγίαν τινὰ καὶ ἀπόῤῥητον Μεταστοιχείωσιν δύναμιν ἀγάγει τὸ λοιπὸν τὸν ἐν οἷς ἂν γένοιτο.

So now all that can be inferr'd from theſe Greek Expreſſions is only this, That the Bread and Wine after the Words of Bleſſing are pronounc'd are chang'd; but how? not into other Subſtances, but in reſpect of their Appointment to a ſolemn and ſacred Office. They were before the common Food of our Bodies, now they are the lively Signs of Chriſt's Body and Blood. Thus poor Fiſhermen were by God's peculiar deſignation turn'd into Apoſtles, and yet the Nature of Men continued in them the ſame.

For the ſame Reaſons the Latin Words uſed by the Fathers who wrote in that Language *, will as little advantage the buſineſs of the real Subſtantial Preſence, ſince their ſignification is as general and unreſtrained as the other. They mean ſome change indeed to be in the holy Materials of the Euchariſt; but it may be ſuch an one as I have aſſign'd, merely as to condition and uſage, ſince no other is determin'd by the ſenſe of the Words as uſed in any Author.

* *Such as Converſion, Tranſmutation, Transformation, Transſignification, Tranſelementation.*

So

So vain is it to argue from an uncertain ſound of words, which have a general unlimited ſenſe, ſince 'tis againſt all the Rules of Reaſon to fix a particular meaning on thoſe Expreſſions, which are delivered in general terms, and ſo may be underſtood many ways.

Indeed, if the Learned Author of the Reaſons, *&c.* could have employ'd the word μετρσίωσις, it would have done excellent ſervice, ſince this perfectly deciphers a converſion of Subſtance, and exactly anſwers Tranſubſtantiation. But he very well knew, that the one is no more to be found among the Greek Fathers, than the other among the Latins. If all the Fathers from Age to Age, aſſerted the Real and Subſtantial Preſence, in very high and expreſſive terms, as the Author ſays they did; How unluckily did they miſs this word μετρσίωσις, which was moſt proper and full to have explain'd ſuch a meaning. The Church of *Rome* hath made ſufficient proviſion, that none may doubt of Hers, by inventing a very high and expreſſive term indeed, Tranſubſtantiation, which I muſt confeſs, has a ſenſe particular, and very deciſive.

We are by this inform'd what was the Belief of the Church in this Article till the fifth Century, and none preſum'd to remove this Foundation of the Faith, till the middle of the Seventh. *Ephrem* Patriarch of *Antioch*, who lived in the beginning of the Sixth; *Facundus* an *African* Biſhop, who flouriſh'd about the middle of the ſame Age; and *Iſidore* Biſhop of *Sevil* in *Spain*, who wrote in the firſt Years of the ſeventh Century, expreſſed themſelves, concerning the Euchariſt, exactly in the ſame manner as all the Fathers before them. *Ephrem* in a Diſcourſe againſt the *Eutychians*, (of which *Photius* hath given us an abſtract) to prove the Diſtinction of the two Natures in Chriſt, takes an Inſtance from the Bread in the Euchariſt, which he aſſerts to retain its proper Subſtance; and that the Body of Chriſt is preſent only to our Minds, and in reſpect of that Grace which is exhibited with the Signs. And accordingly he draws a compariſon between that Sacrament, and Baptiſm; which tho it is wholly Spiritual, yet preſerves the Property of its ſenſible Subſtance, the *Water*, which loſeth nothing of what it was made. *Photius* in Biblioth. p. 794. Ed. *Roth.* 1653.

Facundus ſays plainly, *That neither the Bread is properly Chriſt's Body, nor the Wine his Blood, but that they are called ſo, becauſe they contain in them the Myſtery of his Body and Blood.* *Facundus* lib. 9. c. 5.

Iſidore ſpeaks as clearly to the ſame ſenſe, when he ſays, That *the Blood and the Wine are the two viſible Things in the Eurchariſt, which being* *Iſidor.* Hiſp. de Offic. Eccleſ. lib. 1. cap. 18.

being both of them ſanctified by the Holy Spirit, are turn'd into the Sacrament of the Divine Body.

I might add a great many other, ſince there is no one Writer of theſe Ages, which explain'd their thoughts of the Real Preſence in any other terms. So conſtant and agreeing was the belief of the Church in this Article, till two Greek Monks began to expreſs it in different and ſuſpicious words.

The firſt, whoſe way of writing had any Aſpect looking toward the Real Subſtantial Preſence was *Anaſtaſius*, a Monk of Mount *Sinai*. He was the firſt who denied the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, to be the Signs or Types of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and affirm'd them to be the Things themſelves. And he wrote about the middle of the ſeventh Century.

Anaſtaſ. Sinaita in Ὁδηγῷ, cap. 23.

The other was a Monk of St. *Sabas* in *Paleſtine*, who lived in the Eighth. And the occaſion of his receding from the Ancient Doctrine of the Church, and advancing this new Opinion, was the Conteſt which began in the Greek Church about the Worſhip of Images.

Leo Iſauricus, who ſucceeded *Artemius*, or *Anaſtaſius* the 2*d*, in the Throne of the Grecian Empire, by a publick Edict commanded, that Images ſhould be broken down in all Churches; which was executed, tho not without ſome reſiſtance from the ſuperſtition of the People. The two great Zealots, who inflam'd, and animated the fury of the Rabble againſt their Emperor, were *German* the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and this Monk of the Monaſtery of St. *Sabas* in *Paleſtine*, who from his Grand-father had the Name of *Manſur*; but that by which he was then uſually call'd, and by which he is now moſt known, is *John Damaſcene*. becauſe he was of an Ancient and Illuſtrious Family in *Damaſcus*, He was very active in writing Circulatory Letters in defence of Images, to rekindle the mad Devotion of the People, and to excite them, in defiance unto their Prince's Order, to ſet them up again. Upon this followed horrible Confuſions and Diſorders in the Government; which to appeaſe, the next Emperor *Conſtantine Copronymus* aſſembled a Council at *Conſtantinople*, who by their Deciſions might quiet theſe Differences and Heats, wherein no leſs than 338 Biſhops agreed, with one conſent, to condemn Image-Worſhip, and to eſtabliſh the true Faith concerning the Euchariſt upon that occaſion. It was of ſo many as 338 that Council conſiſted, as appears by the number recorded in the Decree of that Council, which is extant entire in the ſeventh Act of the ſecond *Nicene*. Which great Number, tho the Annaliſt bewails as a diſmal Sign of the Corruption and Apoſtacy of the

Baronii Annal. To. 9. ad Annum 727. pag. 86, & 90. Ed. *Plant.* 1612.

Baron. Ibid. ad Annum 754. pag. 221.

Baron. Ibid. ad Annum 787. pag. 402, 403. & cap. 5. Act. 7. Secundi Niceni Concilii in collect. Labbei Tom. 7.

the Eastern Church, yet it were rather an Indication how pure the Faith had been hitherto preserv'd as to the Eucharist: since all these Fathers, with one Voice, not only determin'd the *Worship of Images to be a revival of the old Idolatry of the Heathens*; but they also defin'd the Sacrament *to be the proper Figure which Christ had given us of his Body.* Because the most plausible Argument for the use of Images was, that Christ as Man might be represented; and so his picture being his Likeness, be reverenc'd, they declar'd, in answer to it, That *to describe the Person of Christ in a Picture, or a Statue, was either with* Nestorius *to divide his Humane Nature from his Divine, of which no Resemblance could be made; or else it would, as* Eutyches, *confound them together.* And farther, to shew how unnecessary and impertinent it was to frame an Image of Christ, they produced *the Eucharist as the true Image which himself had appointed, to represent his Body and his Blood to the exclusion of all other.*

Baronius Annal. To. 9. ad Annum 787. pag. 402, 403. & cap. 5. Act. 6. Secundi Nicæni Conc. in collect. Labbei Tom. 7.

They also particularly Excommunicated *Germain* the Patriarch, *George* Bishop of *Cyprus*, and *John Damascene*, which three had with great heat asserted the Adoration of Images. And the last of the three they mark'd with the black Character of *an Idolater, one injurious to Christ, and a Teacher of Impiety.* This was enough to make his Blood boil, and to alarm him unto a fierce opposition of the Councils Decrees against his Opinion; which he thought himself now as much obliged in Honour, as by Inclination to defend. To vindicate his dear espoused Cause, it was needful to remove the Objection which the Council had rais'd concerning the *Eucharist*, which they affirm'd *to be the sole Image of his Body, that Christ had recommended to us.* To cut this off throughly, he scruples not to assert, what none had ever done before him, That *the Bread, and Wine, and the Water, by the Invocation and coming down of the Holy Ghost, are supernaturally changed into the Body and Blood of Christ; and so now they are no longer two distinct, but one and the same thing.* And a little after he hath these words; *The* Bread, *and the* Wine, *are not the Types and Figures of the* Body *and* Blood *of Christ; God forbid, but they are the Deified* Body *it self of our Lord; since he himself hath said, This is not the Type or Figure of my* Body, *but my* Body; *not the Figure of my* Blood, *but my* Blood. Thus according to the common Observation, that one Error is maintained by bringing in the Aid of another: This Monk calls in the Real Substantial Presence as an Auxiliary to defend the Worship of Images.

Joan. Damascen. de Orthodoxâ Fide. Lib. 4. c. 14.

And

And thus the beginnings of Transformation were form'd, till by degrees it grew up to that monſtrous Opinion, which now frightens all our Senſes and Reaſon. It was firſt introduced, becauſe thought neceſſary for the ſupport of Idolatry, and for the ſame Reaſons the Church of *Rome* at laſt adopted it, and ſo zealouſly continues it. It muſt be confeſs'd, that *Damaſcens* Expreſſion is not preciſely the ſame with Tranſubſtantiation, nor ſpeaks he out ſo broadly as the Church of *Rome* does; yet it hath a very ſuſpicious Face, which looks that way, and imports the ſame thing, though not in expreſs terms. For to ſay that the Bread and Wine are ſo chang'd into Chriſt's Body and Blood, as they are no longer diſtinct, but one and the ſame thing, is in effect to aſſert, that the firſt are tranſubſtantiated into the laſt.

However, theſe two Greek Monks left at leaſt the old Expreſſions concerng the Euchariſt, if not quite abandon'd the Faith; and they were the firſt whoſe new Mode of ſpeaking began to be ſuſpected in this Article.

Baronius, Ibid. Tom. 9. ad Annum 787. pag. 391. Act. 5. ſecundi Niceni Concil. in Collect. Concil. Labbei. Tom. 7.

It was from this Great Champion of Image-Worſhip, that the ſecond Council of *Nice*, (which was conven'd by the Empreſs *Irene*, in the Year 787, to reſcin'd the Acts of the former, and to re-eſtabliſh Images) in their fifth Seſſion examin'd this ſame Argument which the Fathers of that ſame Council at *Conſtantinople* had urged againſt Images to prove them needleſs and frivolous, ſince Chriſt in the Euchariſt had inſtituted the Image of his Body as ſufficient to repreſent him, without any other.

And it is very remarkable, that the Anſwer which they made to it, they borrow entirely from *Damaſcene:* For they declare almoſt in the ſame words as he had done above thirty Years before, *That neither Jeſus Chriſt, nor the Apoſtles, nor the Fathers, have ever call'd the unbloody Sacrifice offer'd by the Prieſts an Image, but they nam'd it the* Body *it ſelf, and the* Blood *it ſelf. The Gifts are call'd, piouſly, Antitypes, by ſome of the Fathers, before the Conſecration is perfected; but after the Conſecration, they are call'd properly, they are really, and are to be believed to be the* Body *and* Blood *of Chriſt, becauſe, if it be the Image of his* Body, *it cannot be the ſame Divine* Body.

But

But tho' *Damaſcene*, and the ſecond Council of *Nice* ſtarted this new, and unto former times unknown Opinion about the Euchariſt; yet the ancient Faith was ſtill preſerved in this Point, and few, or none embraced the Innovation. *Bede* who liv'd in the ſame Age retains the names of Signs or Figures in the Sacrament, when he ſays, that *Our Lord gave us the Sacrament of his Body and Blood under the figure of Bread and Wine, and that he gave to his Diſciples the figure of his Body, and of his Blood.* And *Charles the Great*, who ſurvived long after this Council, writing to his Preceptor *Alcuinus*. *Our Lord*, ſays he, *ſupping, broke the Bread, and gave them the Cup for the Figure of his Body, and his Blood, and gave them a great Sacrament for our profit.*

Beda in Luc. c. 22. Idem in Pſal. 3.

De Rat. Septuag. ad Alcuin.

As two Greek Monks were the firſt who ſtarted this Notion of the real ſubſtantial Preſence in the Eaſtern, ſo a Monk of *Corbie* in 818. was the firſt Inventer of this unintelligible Myſtery in the Weſtern Church. It was *Paſchaſius Ratbertus* who affected a new way of expreſſing himſelf, different from all of the former and of his own Age, denying the Bread and Wine to be Signs of Chriſt's Body, but that the firſt were changed into the Subſtance of the other. To him therefore is due the Honour of hammering out the Notion, tho' not of coyning the word Tranſubſtantiation. And ſo He, not *Berengarius* firſt made the Euchariſt a Controverſie, by diſputing againſt what was before generally receiv'd, *viz.* The real Preſence in the Bread and Wine not ſubſtantially, but as in the Signs, and Sacraments of them, and thus created a Conteſt, which was very warm in his own time, and hath ſince diſtracted all *Chriſtendom*. And he was the firſt original of this Miſchief; for tho *John Damaſcene*, and the ſecond Council of *Nice* declared the ſame thing in Effect, yet beſides that, neither the new Language of the one, nor the Deciſions of the other were much regarded, or thought worthy of notice: This Monk of *Corbie* ſpoke out more plainly, and alarm'd all this part of *Europe* with the Strangeneſs of a new Opinion unheard before, and contrary to the perpetual Belief of the Church in all Ages. And that he was the firſt Father of this now ſo great Article of Faith, both *Bellarmine* and *Sirmondus* frankly own. *That Author* (ſays the famous Cardinal) *was the firſt, who profeſſedly wrote of the Reality of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Euchariſt. And he firſt of all* (ſays the other Learned Jeſuit) *hath ſo explained the true*

Bellarminus de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis. In Paſchaſio Ratberto. *Sirmondus* in vita Paſchaſii præfixa ejus Oper. Impr. Paris.

Senſe of the Catholick Church, that he open'd the way to all others, who have ſince wrote of the ſame matter.

And that his Opinions were new, and founded oddly in the Church, is evident from the rough Entertainment both they and their Author found. If we will believe himſelf, he was deſpiſed as a phantaſtical Young-man, who with a raſh Boldneſs advanc'd new Opinions; or as a wild Viſionary, who would impoſe his Dreams on the reſt of Mankind. For what other occaſion than this could move him to write in ſuch terms as theſe to his intimate Friend? *You have* (ſays he) *at the end of the Book* (meaning his own Diſcourſe of the Body and Blood of Chriſt) *the Sentiments of the Catholick Fathers, which I have briefly marked, that you may know it is not by Enthuſiaſm, or an Inſpiration of Raſhneſs, that I have had theſe Viſions, when I was but yet a young Man.* To what end ſhould he thus expreſs himſelf, were it not to efface thoſe reproachful Aſperſions, which were commonly thrown upon him? And how can we imagine all the learned and good Men of his time would have thus upbraided him, if his Opinions had been conſonant to the Faith of the Church? Or, if indeed he delivered nothing but what was generally believed among Chriſtians; what means he by theſe words to the ſame Friend, propounding ſome Difficulties concerning his Doctrine, *You queſtion me* (ſays he) *upon a thing, of which a great many doubt?* So far was it from being any part of the Catholick Creed. And in his Comment on the 26th of *Matthew*, he ſpeaks his own diffidence how his Opinions were entertain'd. *I have treated* (ſays he) *of theſe things more at length, becauſe I underſtand that ſome reprove me, as if in my Book of the Sacraments, which I have publiſhed, I gave to the words of Chriſt more than the Truth would permit.* So that he ſeems in the whole Conduct of this Affair to manage himſelf like a Man, who deſigned to ſet up himſelf as the Author of a new Hypotheſis in Religion, and agreeably uſes all Addreſſes and Arts of Inſinuation to gain Credit unto his Aſſertions, that they might be accepted.

Paſchaſius Ratbertus Epiſt. ad Frudegardum.

Paſchaſius Ratbertus Ibid.

In Biblioth. Patr. Tom. 6. p. 285. Ed. 3. *Binnii.*

And now what was the dear Opinion, with which he was ſo enamour'd, and which he ſo ſtudiouſly endeavour'd to promote? I will give it in his own words. *Though* (ſays he) *there is the Figure or Appearance of Bread and Wine, yet we muſt abſolutely believe, that it is no other after the Conſecration, than*

Paſchaſius Ratbert. de Corp. & Sang. Domini, c. 1. in Biblioth. Pat. Ibid. 247.

the

the Body and Blood of Christ: For which Reason Truth it self said to his Disciples, It is my Flesh for the Life of the World. And to speak something more admirable (observe how he applauds the rarity of his Notion) *It is not at all any other Flesh, than what is born of the Virgin* Mary, *which suffered on the Cross, and is risen from the Grave.* This, I must confess, is to assert the Real and Substantial Presence in high and expressive terms: But herein he is alone, since none ever before him, but two Greek Monks, and the Conventicle at *Nice*, offer'd any thing resembling; nor had he above two or three of his Contemporaries to follow him. I am sure all the Learning and Piety of the Times wherein he lived, vigorously oppos'd him; and how much they differ'd from him, let us but hear from himself. After having repeated the words of the Institution, *Take, eat, this is my Body*, he adds, *Let those who will extenuate this term of Body saying, that it is not the true Flesh of Jesus Christ which we celebrate in the Sacrament, nor his true Blood, but hear these words: They feign I know not what, as though there was in the Sacrament, only a certain vertue of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in such manner that our Savior must have spoke false, and that it is not indeed the true Flesh, and the true Blood,* &c. *When he broke and gave the Bread to his Disciples, he said not, This is, or there is in this Mystery a certain Vertue, or a Figure of my Body, but he hath said, This is my Body.* And a little after, *I am amaz'd at it, that some now will say it is not the reality of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the thing it self, but in the Sacrament, a certain Efficacy of the Flesh, and not the Flesh; a Vertue of the Blood, and not the Blood; a Figure, and not the Reality; a Shadow, and not the Body.*

Paschasius Ratbertus Comment. in Mat. 26. pag. 290. Ibid.

And this Doctrine, which all believed but himself, is perfectly agreeable to what was the Faith of the Antient Church, and is now the Faith of the Protestant Churches.

So upon the whole, That Catholick Church which hath in all Ages, according to the Author of the Reasons, &c. asserted the Real and Substantial Presence is no where as yet to be found but in this poor Monk of *Corbie*, or two or three deluded by him, since all the rest of *Christendom* asserted the Real Presence no otherwise than as in the beginning of the Discourse I explained it, and have prov'd it to be the meaning of the Fathers, and general Consent of the Church, till this unhappy Age, wherein *Ratbertus* in his Melancholy Cell hammers out

a Notion, which hath fill'd the World with Diſputes, and puzled the beſt Wits of the Church of *Rome* to make it out.

No ſooner had this Innovator thus begun to change the Doctrine of Faith, than a Holy Zeal for the Truth warm'd the greateſt Men of the Age wherein he liv'd, to draw their Pens againſt him, and ſome of them were heated to a little Indignation.

Antonin. Chron. part. 2. Tit. 14. c. 5. pag. 423. Ed. Junt. Lug.

Rabanus Maurus was the moſt conſiderable Perſon of his Time for Learning and Wit: As a Poet he is prais'd by *Antoninus*, that he excelled all who lived with him; and in all reſpects *Trithemius* adorns him with this high Elogy, That *Italy* never ſaw any thing reſembling him, nor *Germany* ever produc'd his equal. From a Monk of the Monaſtery of *Fuld* a City on the *Frontiers* of *Franconia*, he was created Abbot of it; from whence his Merits remov'd him to the Arch-biſhoprick of *Mentz*, where, by the command of *Lewis* the Second, Emperor, he conven'd a Synod, which Decreed ſeveral things uſeful for the Reformation of that Church. So that his Character gives him more Authority to ſupport him, than a private Monk. He through all his Writing aſſerts the true and ancient Faith of the Church, in oppoſition to what *Ratbertus* had newly vented, and calls his, a wicked Opinion.

Trithem. in Catal. Script. Eccleſ.

Rabanus Maurus in pœnitent. cap. 33. de Euchariſt.

Walafridus Strabo, who, by the account *Antoninus* gives of him, was Scholar to him I have mentioned, joyn'd with him in defending the ſame Truth againſt this dangerous Innovation. To theſe I might add a great many others, *Amalarius*, and *Heriboldus*; the one Arch-biſhop of *Treves*, the other Biſhop of *Auxerre*, both of them Famous for Learning and Wiſdom, which recommended the latter of them to the Favour of his Prince, *Charles the Bald*. And with theſe *Prudentius* Biſhop of *Troys*, and *Florus* Deacon of *Lyons*, united in the ſame Zeal to overturn the Novel Tenents of this Monk.

Antonin. Ibid. p. 494.

Robert. Altiſſiodor. Mon. Chron. citante Uſſerio de Eccleſ. Succeſ. c. 2.

But there were two of greater Name, who profeſſedly wrote againſt him by the particular Command of *Charles the Bald*, who, ſenſible of the Diviſions which this Novelty in Religion had made among his Subjects, to ſtop the growing Diſorder, employed the two Men who had the higheſt Reputation for Learning to refute it. Theſe two were *Joannes Scotus Erigena*, and *Bertram*. The firſt of them was admir'd as the moſt accompliſh'd in all kind of Knowledg; for whom,

as

as the Emperor had a peculiar eſteem, ſo he conſulted his Judgment, eſpecially in this new-rais'd Controverſie about the Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, and order'd him to confute *Ratbert*. In Obedience to which Command (as appears by an Epiſtle of *Berengarius*, extant in the Collections of *D'Achery*) he compos'd that Diſcourſe of the Sacrament, which was afterward judg'd Heretical, and condemned to be burnt by the Council which was called at *Vercelli* againſt *Berengarius*. But however the Book afterward met with this hard Fate, yet in this Age neither that, or its Author were ever queſtion'd; and tho' that Learned Man, for ſome uncommon Opinions which he held, had rais'd himſelf great Enemies, and amongſt the reſt, *Remy* Arch-biſhop of *Lyons*, and *Florus* the Arch-deacon, who treated him with ſharpneſs enough, yet they never accuſed him of any Error as to the Euchariſt, which they would never fail'd to have done, if he had advanc'd any Opinion contrary to the general Faith. He liv'd and died in the favour of the two greateſt Princes of that Age, *Alfred*, and *Charles* the Emperor, who would certainly have diſowned him, if he had been tainted with Hereſie. He poſſeſs'd Employments in the Church, to which he would never have been admitted, if he had in the leaſt been blacken'd with ſo invidious a Character. He left the Emperor's Court upon the Invitation he had from *Alfred* into *England*, that he might be the Principal Ornament of the new-founded Univerſity at *Oxford*; and to him he alſo truſted the Education of his Children. And yet this Man ſo much admir'd and courted by two Kings, muſt be an Apoſtate from the Faith, and an Heretick, and *Paſchaſius* be the only true Catholick. He after this was choſen to read Divinity in the Monaſtery at *Malmsbury*, where by the young Scholars, at the Inſtigation of the Monks, he was ſtabb'd; and afterwards (as *Antoninus* tells us) was accounted a Martyr: And as *Leſly* the Scottiſh Hiſtorian reports it, 'Twas by the Authority of the Pope he was enroll'd in that Catalogue. And beſides the Teſtimony of theſe two Hiſtorians, the ſame thing is manifeſt by his Epitaph, extant in *William* of *Malmsbury*:

Antonin. Chron. part. 2. Tit. 16. c. 2. p. 601. *Leſlæus* de Rebus Geſtis Scotor. Lib. 5.

Here lies John *the Holy Philoſopher, who in his Life was enriched with admirable Learning, and at laſt had the Honour to paſs through Martyrdom to the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Gulielmus Malmsbur. de Geſtis Regum Angl. lib. 2. cap. 5.

Which

Coſini Hiſt. Tranſubſtant. Papal. cap. 5. ſect. 32.

Which makes the Conjecture of the Learned Biſhop of *Durham* probable, that the occaſion of his Murther was, becauſe ſome ſuperſtitious Monks of that Monaſtery, who were infected with *Ratbert*'s wild Notions, could not bear to hear him refute them in his Lectures, and ſo urg'd the young Scholars to aſſaſſinate him. And therefore with reaſon might he be judged a Martyr, as dying for defence of the Truth, againſt the Innovations of the *Corbeian* Monk.

It is a great unhappineſs that his Book is loſt, being unjuſtly branded with Hereſie, and burnt by the *Vercellian* Council, when Death had removed the Author far enough out of their reach. We may yet be certain, that he affirm'd the Bread and Wine to be Signs of Chriſt's Body and Blood, ſince *Berengarius*, as he profeſs'd to have had this Doctrine from him, ſo he pleaded the Name of this Great Man in his defence. And by this we may be aſſur'd too, that he denied the Real ſubſtantial Preſence, ſince his laſt Writing was compos'd expreſly againſt *Paſchaſius Ratbertus*, who had newly broach'd that Opinion.

I will not ſay much of the other excellent Perſon employ'd by *Charles the Bald* in the ſame Work with *Joannes Scotus*: By whoſe Order he compil'd againſt *Ratbert* that incomparable Diſcourſe of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which, to the great benefit of the Church, had a better deſtiny than that of *Erigena*, and ſtill hath ſurviv'd. Of which, becauſe newly tranſlated into our own Language, I need ſay the leſs, ſince every one who hath but the curioſity, may ſee what Doctrine was taught in thoſe days; and that it was indeed the ſame for which *Berengarius* in the Apoſtacy of following Times, almoſt Two hundred years after, was falſly convicted of Hereſie. I will only add this concerning *Bertram*, or *Ratramn*, that he was not only in great favour with his King, but of ſo high eſteem in the Church, that he was choſen by all the Clergy of *France*, to write in defence of the Latin Church againſt the Greek.

And this is enough to convince, that the Doctrine of *Paſchaſius* concerning the Real ſubſtantial Preſence, was not only new, and unknown, but deteſted by all the worthy men of his Age; and indeed I ſhould have wondred by what ſtrange Infatuation it obtained amongſt any in the following Century,

Century, and so by degrees grew into credit amongst many of the Priests; if I did not reflect what gross Ignorance darken'd all the Times interveening, between the condemnation of *Berengarius*, and the Death of *R. Maurus*, *J. Scotus*, *Bertram*, &c. As if the last small remains of Piety and Learning, had expired with the Breath of those Great Men, and forsook the World when they left it. It is then no wonder, if in the succeeding age, grosly stupid, and which had an unaccountable Devotion to Adoration of Images, and Invocation of Saints; the most unreasonable Assertion that was ever offered to Mens Minds, was embraced: And in an Age, that began to be so strangely addicted to Idolatry, it is not to be admired, if a Doctrine was readily received, which might be thought serviceable to promote it: Since, as I before observed, it was to defend the Worship of Images, which induced *Damascene*, and the second Council of *Nice*, to give birth to this Notion of the Real Substantial Presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament.

But as yet this Opinion of *Paschasius Ratbertus* was not established by the Authority of the Church, since the two Popes, *Nicholas* the First, and *Adrian* the Second, were silent Spectators of the new raised Quarrel, without interesting themselves. And though the Novelty, for the Reasons I have mentioned, pleased many of the Priests, and in time acquired some number of followers, yet through the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, the greatest part of the Church still retained the Ancient Faith; and it was the ordinary business of their Disputes, to hunt down this new-started Opinion.

Thus when *Odo Severus* was Archbishop of *Canterbury*, in the Year 950. there was a great contest among his Clergy concerning the Eucharist; some affirming the former Substance to continue, and that it was only the Figure, or Sign of Christs Body and Blood. And all that the Archbishop alleadged in solution of the Argument, was only the Instances of strange incredible Miracles wrought by the Sacrament. for this was the course they took to spread the belief of the Real Substantial Presence among the People.

Balæus Script. Brit. Cent. 2. pag. 128. Ed. 1557. Et *Guliel. Malmsbur.* de Gestis Pontif. Angl. Lib. 1.

The Priests, by several Impostures, and *lying Miracles*, which they ascrib'd to the Host, endeavoured to perswade them, that it was really Christ's Body, since they could not think that

that any other was capable of doing ſuch prodigious things. But only the Ignorant were obnoxious to be ſo groſly abuſed by vain frivolous Stories; and among the Wiſe and Learned, few Proſelytes were gain'd; for they ſtill expreſſed themſelves the old way, contrary to *Paſchaſius*.

Anſwer to a Jeſuit. p. 54. *laſt Ed.* 1686.

Of theſe numerous Inſtances might be given, as of *Ælfric* Abbot of *Malmsbury*, (whoſe Saxon Homily is cited to this purpoſe by the moſt Pious and Learned *Uſher*) of *Wulfine* Biſhop of *Sherburn*, *Heringerius* Abbot of *Lobes*, *Ratherius* Biſhop of *Verona*, *Lutheric* Archbiſhop of *Sens*, *Fulbert* Biſhop of *Chartres*, and innumerable others of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries.

But *Paſchaſius Ratbert's* Doctrine of Chriſts ſubſtantial Preſence getting ground among the Vulgar by the Artifices of the Prieſts, in the Eleventh Age *Brunon* the Biſhop, and *Berengarius* the Arch-Deacon of *Angers* diſdaining to ſee the Error ſpread ſo faſt, were more than ordinarily zealous in oppoſing it. But it was more endear'd to the Clergy by the awe and veneration which they found the Belief of it had procured to them among the People, who could not but reverence, almoſt to Adoration, Perſons who had ſuch extraordinary power: As firſt, to make their God, and then to carry it about in their hands. They were highly alarm'd, that any ſhould attempt to diſabuſe the poor Creatures, and therefore the honeſt endeavours of *Brunon* and *Berengarius* ſet all the Prieſthood on a flame who raiſed a diſmal cry againſt the good Biſhop, and his Archdeacon, as Heretics, and Enemies of the Church.

Platina in vita *Leon.* IX.

It was *Leo* IX. who then ſate in the Papal Chair, a Man of Honeſty and Integrity, but good-natur'd and eaſie, and Governed by the Councils of *Humbert* and *Hildebrand* whom he created Cardinals. It was no difficulty for the Enemies of *Berengarius* to make him believe any thing they had a mind he ſhould, & therefore they ſoon poſſeſs'd him with a prejudice againſt the Archdeacons Doctrine, and obtained of him to call a Synod at *Rome* to ſtop that which they called a moſt Peſtilent Hereſie. Here *Berengarius* was condemned abſent and unheard, without their ſo much as knowing what his Opinion was, but as it was odiouſly repreſented by his ſworn Adverſaries, much leſs examining, and debating it. And *Lanfrank* himſelf who was afterward the man which wrote with the greateſt bitterneſs againſt him

Lanfrancus de Sacramento. In Bibliotheca patr. Tom. 6. Ed. 3. *Binnii.* pag. 302. &c. *Baron.* Annal. Tom. 11. ad An. 1050. *Baronius* Ibid. *Lanfrancus* Ibid.

was

was ſuſpected as a favourer of his Opinions, and probably not without reaſon, ſince there was ſome intimacy of friendſhip between them, as appears by the Letters of *Berengarius* to him, wherein he freely communicated his Thoughts which Letters being Intercepted brought him into ſuſpicion, and he was required to purge himſelf by openly proteſting againſt him and his Doctrine; which he did. This Council was Celebrated at *Rome* in 1050.

Brunon was cooled by the fear of his powerful oppoſers, but *Berengarius* ſtood firm, and was not ſo much diſheartned as animated by this Judgment of the Council, to make a more vigorous defence, and by the force of his reaſons, and the inſtances he produced from Antiquity, which countenanced his Doctrine, it ſo admirably ſpread, that there were few in all *France* which did not entertain it, ſo little were they Influenced by the decrees of the *Roman* Council.

Matth. Paris, Hiſtor. Angliæ pag. 17. Ed. Prima, *Lond.* 1571.

Upon this the Pope thought it neceſſary to renew againſt him the Thunder of the Church, and in the latter end of the ſame year aſſembles another Council at *Vercells*, and that the procedings of this might look fairer than thoſe of the former, they ſummoned *Berengarius* to appear, who came not in perſon, but ſent two of his Clergy to act his cauſe for him. But he was as ſpeedily condemned in this Council as the former, and with him *Joannes Scotus Erigena* tho' dead long before ſuffered the ſame Fate, and his Book againſt *Paſchaſius Ratbertus* order'd to be burnt.

Lanfrancus Ibid. pag. 303.

Now *Paſchaſius* his opinion was ſtrengthened by the Authority of the Church; and as intereſt governs a great part of Mankind, it is no wonder, if that which before had but few aſſenters, now was by many zealouſly embraced, when backed with Power, and recommended by advantage. And yet ſtill the proſcribed *Berengarius* had many Advocates who ſtood up in his defence, and all that was yet done, rather fomented than extinguiſhed the heat of the Diſpute.

Victor the Second, who was *Leo*'s Succeſſor, in the papal Dignity convenes another Council at *Tours* in *France*, which next followed that at *Vercells*. The Author of the Reaſons, *&c.* makes one to meet at *Paris*, that number might not be wanting, but upon what grounds I know not, unleſs on the Authority of *Durandus*, Abbot of *Troarn* in *Normandy*, who ſpeaks of a Council called at *Paris* by *Henry* the firſt; but the little credit of the Story is ſufficiently expoſed by that great Church Antiquary Monſieur *Larroque*. It was in 1055. that *Victor* ſummoned this Council at *Tours*, where *Berengarius* freely appears, when he could do it now with ſafety of his Perſon. In this Council *Hildebrand* who was afterward *Gregory* the Seventh, preſides as the Pope's Legate in

Baronius Annal. Tom. 11. ad Annum. 1055.

Hiſtoire de l'euchariſtie part. 2. Chap. 17.

in *France*, who if we will believe *Guitmundus*, soon convinced *Berengarius*, and prevailed with him to subscribe his Recantation, and that, if *Lanfranc* says true without speaking a word in his own Defence. But besides that we have but little reason to trust his professed Adversaries who breathe the greatest Passion and fierceness against him, *Lanfranc* contradicts *Guitmundus* when he tells us that all his Recantation was only an acknowlegment, that he professed the common Faith of the Church, which he might very well do without renouncing his own Doctrine, since it was perfectly agreeable. He might indeed disclaim what he never affirmed, that the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, are empty, naked Signs and Figures unaccompanied with any Spiritual Efficacy, but this was to explain his Faith, and to vindicate it from their mistaken Prejudices, not to deny it.

Guitmundus de Sacrament. l. 3. in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 6. pag. 368. Ed. 3. *Binnii.*

Lanfranc. de Sacrament. Ibid. pag. 303.

Lanfranc. Ibid.

However he resolutely persisted in asserting his Doctrine, and all these Council's had very little availed to suppress it. Nor were his Enemies satisfied in the former profession of his Faith at *Tours*. It was not enough for him to deny the Elements of the Eucharist to be mere Signs, but they will have him to assert the real Presence in all the gross Terms wherein themselves explained it, as any Man may read them in the Discourses of *Lanfrancus Guitmundus* and *Algesius* concerning the Sacrament. They will therefore oblige him to sign a new Confession, which might be fully expressive of the corporeal Presence. To this purpose they prevail with *Nicholas* the second to convocate a fourth Council against him, which he did in the Lateran at *Rome*, in the year 1059. wherein himself was present with a Hundred and thirteen Bishops. Hither *Berengarius* comes in person upon the Summons. But he did not at the very first abjure without pleading any thing in defence of his Faith, as *Lanfranc* relates the matter, who scruples not to report, that he dar'd not defend his doctrine, but presently resigned himself to the Judgment of the Council, ready to believe whatever they would have him, and therefore asked that they would compose a Formulary for him, which he might subscribe. On the contrary the controversy was warmly disputed, and *Berengarius* was not wanting to employ in his cause all that Learning and Eloquence for which he was justly famous. And so Invincible is the force of Truth with such succours to aid it that as *Leo* the Cardinal of *Ostia*, and B. *Sigonius* tell us he bore down all before him, and not a Man in the Council could withstand the Strength of his Discourses, only *Alberic* the Cardinal Deacon, a Man Learned and Eloquent coped with him, but with unequal ability, and was reduced to demand eight days time to frame an Answer against him. It may therefore very much be suspected, that more sensible Arguments than

Baronius Annal. To. 11. ad Annum 1059. *Algerus* de Sacrament. l. 1. c. 19. In Biblioth. Patr. To. 6. p. 419. *Lanfranc.* de Sacrament. Ibid. p. 301. In Chron. Cassini. Lib. 3. c. 33. *Sigonius* de Regn. Italiæ Lib. 9. pag. 211. *Ed. Wechelii.* *Papyrius Massonius* Annal. Franc. Lib. 3. pag. 236. *Ed. Paris.* Quarto.

Reason,

Reasons were made use of to force him to abjure, and that they failed not to employ all that might be effectual to conquer the weakness of a Man. However he did now make a full Recantation, and because they would be sure to have it in all respects ratifyed, it was by order of the Pope and Council drawn by the Cardinal *Humbert* in these terms, as now extant in *Lanfrancus*, and *Algerus*, and *Gratian*, from whom I will transcribe it, for the Author of the Reasons, &c. hath given it very imperfect.

This then is the Form of the Abjuration: I Berengarius *the unworthy Deacon of St.* Maurice, *of the Church of* Angiers, *Knowing the true Catholick and Apostolical Faith, Anathematize all Hereſy, especially that for which I have hitherto been defamed; which endeavours to maintain, that the Bread and Wine which are placed upon the Altar, are after the Consecration only a Sacrament, and not the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; nor that he can, unless Sacramentally only, be sensually handled or broken with the Hands of the Priest, or be broken or grinded between the Teeth of the Faithful. But I consent to the Holy Roman and Apostolic Sees; and with Mouth and Heart, I profess that I hold the same Faith concerning the Sacraments of the Lord's Table; which* Nicholas *the Lord and venerable Pope, and this Holy Synod, with Evangelical and Apostolical Authority hath delivered and confirmed to me to be held,* viz. *That the Bread and Wine which are put upon the Altar after the Consecration, are not only the Sacrament, but the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and sensually not only Sacramentally, but in reality is handled and broken by the Hands of the Priests, and grinded with the Teeth of the Faithful; swearing by the Holy and Coessential Trinity, and by these most Holy Gospels of Christ. But those who shall oppose this Faith, I pronounce to be worthy of eternal Anathema, together with their Opinions and Followers. But if I my self at any time presume to think or declare any thing against this, I must submit to the severity of the Canons.. To this read and perfected, I have freely subscribed,*

This is what was forced on *Berengarius* to Subscribe, which we cannot doubt but was done against the inward sence of his own mind; since *Lanfranc* himself upbraids him that his Abjuration was dissembled, and only in shew, not in the sincerity of his heart. *Lanfranc. Ibid.* p. 300.

And *Berengarius* himſelf as ſoon as out of their power writes a Book to retract his Abjuration. No ſooner is he out of the noiſe of their Threats, and his own ſilenced fears permitted his ſtrain'd Soul to return to its natural poſture; but he writes againſt the Pope and Council in the ſharpeſt Expreſſions, which the Indignation of a wronged, and abuſed Conſcience could dictate. He affords them no better name than a *Church of Malignants, a Council of Vanity, not Apoſtolical, but the Seat of Satan.* He grievouſly complains that this Recantation was extorted from him either by threats, or more violent methods, and that it was not to be Interpreted his Act, ſo much as *Humberts*, who compoſed the Form of it for him, and forced his hand to ſubſcribe it. And theſe juſt Reproaches *Lanfrancus* makes it his great care to wipe out.

Apud Lanfranum ib. p. 312.

Ibid. p. 300.

And yet the Pope, and his Council accounted it a great Victory, which they gained over him, and in Triumph ſent the Copies of his Abjuration through all the Cities of *Italy*, *Germany*, and *France*.

Baronius Annal. Tom. 11. ad An. 1059. *Gratian* Decr. part 2. diſt. 2. cap. 42.

Pope *Nicholas* the II. being otherwiſe employed in maintaining the Wars which he had raiſed in *Apulia*, *Berengarius* lived undiſturbed almoſt thirty years, till the furious *Hildebrand* came to the Papacy, which he aſſumed with the name of *Gregory* VII. In the ſeventh year of his Popedom, and 1079. of our Redemption he calls a Synod at *Rome*, where *Berengarius* now fourſcore years old, being ſummoned a ſecond time, appears. Here when his Controverſie came to be debated, the Biſhops of the Council were divided, and he had many of them, who diſputed on his ſide. And it would ſeem as if the Council was almoſt equally parted between the Pope and *Berengarius*. If what the Cardinal *Benno* reports be true, that *Gregory* appointed a Faſt to all the Cardinals, that God might manifeſt by a ſign from Heaven who was moſt Orthodox in the Faith, He, or *Berengarius*. This looks as though a good number of his Biſhops ſtood ſo firm for *Berengarius*, that nothing leſs than a Miracle could ſhake them. At leaſt the Opinion in thoſe times of the Popes Infallibility was very mean, ſince it needed to be ſtrengthned by ſome Divine Oracle. But as God did not ſpeak in the Council, ſo the whole Affair was decided without him, and the poor old *Berengarius* was a ſecond time obliged to abjure though in a different Form, then that impoſed on him in the preceding Council.

In Act. Concil.

Benno Card. in vita *Hildebr.*

It

It runs in these Terms.

I Berengarius *believe with my heart, and confess with my mouth, that the Bread and Wine which are placed upon the Altar, and by the Mystery of Consecration, and the words of our Redeemer substantially changed, into the true, and proper, and quickning Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord, and that after the Consecration it is the true Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, and which Offered for the Salvation of the World did hang on the Cross, and which sits at the right hand of the Father, and the true Blood of Christ, which was poured out from his side, not only by a sign and virtue of the Sacrament but in the property of Nature, and truth of substance, as is contained in this brief*; *and I have read, and you understand, so I believe, nor will I farther teach contrary to this Faith. So help me God, and these Holy Gospels of God.* Baronius An. Tom. 11. ad An. 1079.

This was his last * Abjuration, which he did not long survive; whether he recovered his true Faith again is variously reported by Historians, but if we will credit one who lived in his time, and so was capable of giving the best account of him, he to his latest breath continued in the Belief, and maintaining of his true Doctrine. But almost all agree in honouring him with a very Glorious Character, as a person every way Excellent, Learned above all of his time, and of most strict and exemplary holiness. And when broken with so many troubles, he retired from the World; he distributes a large Estate, which he possessed, among the Poor; his deserved Reputation made him lov'd and admir'd, and the truth of his Doctrine managed with his admirable wit perswaded great numbers to embrace it, so that as † Historians assure us, it was become the General Faith, and his Enemies could not otherwise have run it down but by Force and Power.

Nor did his Doctrine expire with his Life. We have the Testimony of one of our own Historians, that in the year 1163. almost an hundred after his death, all *France*, *Spain*, *Italy* and *Germany*, was filled with his Disciples.

* *Bertold.* constant. *Chron.* An. 1083. Apud Urstesii Histor. Illustr. *German. Anton. Chron.* part 2. Tit. 16. c. 1. Sect. 28. pag. 507. Ed. Junt. † *Mat. Paris* Hist. *Angl.* pag. 17. Ed. *Lond.* prima. 1571. *Antoninus* lb. *Guilielmus Neubrig* de Rebus *Anglicis* sui Temp. Lib. 2. cap. 13. *Wernerus Rolewink.* Fascic. Temporum ad Annum 1054. Apud Pistor. Tom. 2. *Germ.* Scriptor.

And

And though the opinion of *Paſchaſius Ratbertus* thus ſtamp'd with the pretended Authority of the Church in five ſeveral Councils paſs'd more currantly among ſome now than before, when it was left to be debated by Arguments; yet it was not admitted by all, and in defiance to theſe deciſions the Doctrine of *Berengarius* was conſiderable both for the number and quality of thoſe who openly maintained it. For *Urban* the ſecond, the Succeſſor of *Gregory* the Seventh thought it neceſſary to aſſemble another Council at *Piacenza* in *Italy*, in the Year 1095. to renew the Condemnation of that Doctrine. And yet this was not ſtrong enough to enforce a General Renunciation; for thoſe who were moſt famous in Learning and Piety in the next Century ſtill preſerved and vindicated the antient Faith, and among the reſt, St. *Bernard* in 1120. moſt clearly explains his Sence agreeable to it, when he diſcourſes of the Elements in the Euchariſt as viſible Signs, which convey to us Inviſible Grace and Bleſſings. And *Rupert Abbot* of *Duitz*, near *Cologne*, (which inſtance the Author of the Reaſons he himſelf aſſigns) tho' he had a notion peculiar to himſelf at that time of a natural Union between Chriſt and the Bread, yet contrary to what theſe Councils had decreed, he denied the ſubſtantial Converſion of one into the other. And *Peter Lombard* himſelf, the Father of the Schoolmen, who wrote his Book of Sentences about 1140. tho he thinks it conſonant to the Mind of the Fathers, that there is a change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, (which none will deny to be underſtood in a tollerable Senſe) yet he was not ſo ſtrong in the new Faith, as to be certain whether the Change was ſubſtantial, but leaves it as a doubt. He indeed exerciſes all the Skill which he had in Philoſophy to evince the being of Accidents without a Subject, and to explain how Chriſt's Body might be broken into Parts, to ſalve as well as he could the credit of Pope *Nicholas* the Second and his Council, in the Form of Abjuration impoſed by them on *Berengarius*.

Berthold. Conſtant chron. ad 1095 apudUſſitium Ibid.

Bernardus de cæna domini

Rupertus Tuitienſis in Exod. lib. 2. cap. 10.

Lombard. ſent. lib. 4. diſt. 10.

Ibid. diſt. 11.

It is needleſs to give any more Inſtances, Monſieur *Larroque* hath done it ſufficiently in his Hiſtory of the Euchariſt, and ſince that excellent Book is in *Engliſh*, any one may ſatisfy himſelf, that tho' the governing and intereſted part of the Church of *Rome*, had run down *Berengarius*, yet they could not his Doctrine, tho' they attempted it with the greateſt Induſtry and

L'Hiſtoire de l'Euchariſtie part. 2. ch. 18.

and Violence. A multitude of People in the Southern Provinces of *France*, first called *Albigenses*, and afterward *Waldenses* professed the same Faith, as that learned Man proves out of many Authors, and amongst the rest, from the Chronicle of St. *Tron*, in the Country of *Leige*, he gives this evidence of it: That *Rodolphus* the Abbot of that Monastery, to which he was preferred in 1125. and Author of the Chronicle, assigns this to be the Reason, which diverted him from an intended Journey into a certain Country which he names not; *That he heard it to be all infected with the antient Heresy of the Body and Blood of Christ.* And there was indeed an entire Country so infected, if there be any Contagion in Truth, and the fiercest proceedings could not stop its spreadings, and tho' *Peter de Bruis*, as the first Martyr that protested against Transubstantiation was publickly burnt at St. *Giles*'s in *Languedoc*; yet the Doctrine which he taught, as if scattered with his Ashes, was dispersed more than ever, nor was their Cruelty to *Arnauld* of *Bress* more successful, whom they burnt alive at *Rome* in the year 1155, and threw his Ashes into the *Tyber*; for many began to suspect that to be a Truth, which before they had not so well considered; when they saw these Men suffer for it with so admirable Constancy. Such examples at least raised a Commiseration of the unfortunate, if they did not convince.

Apud d'Acherium. Tom. 7. Specileg.

Otto Frising. in Frider. lib. 2. c. 20. apud Urstitium German. Rer. script.

But tho' the new Church of *Rome* was so zealous for her late adopted Article of Faith, as to sacrifice Mens Lives to support it, yet she wanted a fit name by which the Invention might be called, till the middle of the twelfth Century. It is doubted who first blessed the World with so charming a word as Transubstantiation. The Author of the Reasons, &c. would ascribe the word to *Paschasius Rathertus*, who first beat out the Notion, or at least makes him a doubtful Rival with *Petrus Blesensis* in the Honour. But there is not the least Character of this wonderful word in the writings of *Paschasius*, and therefore the Glory would belong entirely to *Blesensis*, if *Stephen* Bishop of *Autun* were not brought on the Stage to dispute it with him. This is sure enough that they both use the Expression, but which of them was the Father of it is dubious, nor is it indeed very important to know.

Blesensis Epist. 140.

Stephan. Eduensis de Sacr. Alt. in Bibliotheca. patrum Tom. 6. ed. 3. Binnii p. 476.

It is certain the Word had the Good fortune to please, so that *Innocent* the III. who succeeded *Cælestine* the III. in the Papacy made it Sacred, and inviolable by placing it in the Decree of his

Lateran

Platina in ejus vita.

Lateran Council. He was but thirty years of Age, when he mounted the Chair, and active, and brisk, in the heat of his youth, he meditated nothing but Greatneſs, and a Spiritual Monarchy. He deſigned nothing leſs than to Conquer the World by the power of the Keys, as the Old *Romans* had ſubdued it with their Swords, and to make that City as great in Spiritual Dominion, as her Ancient Citizens by their Courage had made her in Temporal, it is eaſie to deſcribe him by the Picture, which himſelf hath drawn, and he ſufficiently expreſſes the Ambition of his Spirit, when he Arrogates to himſelf that Commiſſion which was given to the Prophet. *To me* (ſays he) *it is ſpoken in the Prophet, I have appointed thee over Nations, and Kingdoms, that thou mayſt root out, deſtroy, and ruine, build, and plant. To me alſo it is ſaid in the perſon of the Apoſtle, to thee I will give the Keys of Heaven, for I am conſtituted in the midſt between God and Man, below God but above Man; yes, then Man I am greater, who can judge of all things, but be judged by none.* And it is a very pleaſant compariſon that he makes between the two Great Lights, which God Created in the Heaven, and Himſelf, and Kings. *As much difference as there is* (ſays he) *between the Sun and the Moon, ſo great is that between the Biſhops of* Rome *and Kings.* Suitable to this Character which he gives of himſelf is that by which our own Hiſtorian repreſents him. *He was Ambitious and Proud* (ſays *Matthew Paris*) *above all other Mortals, and prone and ready to all wickedneſs, for any reward either given or promiſed.* None could be a fitter Man then this to impoſe Tranſubſtantiation both thing and name on the Faith of the Church, ſince upon that Authority he had aſſumed to himſelf, he might venture to obtrude the higeſt abſurdities and contradictions without any fear of their being Queſtioned. He accordingly in a Council conven'd by him in the *Lateran* at *Rome* ſtroke the ſtrongeſt blow to faſten this ſtrange Article into the *Roman* Creed, which the Council at *Conſtance* in condemning *Wicliffs* Doctrine, farther confirmed, and the Council at *Trent* ſo irreverſibly eſtabliſhed, that it is become as neceſſary a part of Faith as the belief of the Trinity, or of Chriſts Incarnation. And this is the true Hiſtory of the Original, and progreſs of Tranſubſtantiation, which now hath inſenſibly led me to the Third thing I propounded to prove, which is, that this odd Doctrine both in the notion and name hath been determined by the Church of *Rome* as a neceſſary Article of Faith.

Jer. 1. 10. *Innocen.* III. Serm. 2.

Epiſt. ad Imp. *Conſtantinop.* Extra de Majorit. & obed. c. 6.

Matth. Paris Hiſt. *Angl.* In vita *Johan.*

There would need no more to evidence it than the former Hiſtory

ſtory of *Berengarius*, ſince the Decrees of ſo many Councils againſt him iſſue all in this, to define the manner of the Real Preſence in the Sacrament to be by the converſion of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and therefore nothing would ſatisfie till he had abjured in the plaineſt words they could find moſt ſuitable to expreſs this Sence. This appears by that Form I have before given out of *Gratian*, wherein it was not thought enough to ſay that the Bread and Wine after Conſecration are the true Body and Blood of Chriſt, but in what manner they are ſo, is pronounced in high, and groſs terms, that Chriſts Body is Senſually, and not meerly as in a Sacrament, handled by the Prieſt broken into parts, and grinded *by the teeth of the Faithful.* *Gratian* Loc. antea citato.

If this does not very groſly determine the *Modus* of the Real Preſence, I know not what can. And yet this is done by Pope *Nicholas* the II. and his Council called by him at *Rome*, and impoſed on poor *Berengarius* to be believed under pain of the ſevereſt Curſes and Puniſhments; nor was it only forced on him, but declared to be a Rule of Faith to all other Men. And therefore *Lanfrancus*, and *Algerus*, in writing againſt him Appeal to the deciſion of this, and of the other Councils as the ſure Standard, and Meaſure of Catholick Truth, it is accordingly placed in the Decretals of *Gratian*; and *Lombard* thought himſelf engaged to defend it, which he does very poorly; The expreſſions indeed are ſo rude that they far exceed all that the Impudence of the Schools ever delivered in their moſt nice and boldeſt Diſputes, and therefore at laſt when no tolerable account could be given of their meaning, from pure ſhame they diſclaimed them. The Author of the Gloſs on *Gratian*, when he comments on thoſe words *handled, and broken by the hands of the Prieſts, &c.* tells us that *thoſe words, if not underſtood in a right ſence, will lead us into a greater Hereſie than that of* Berengarius. *Lombard.* Sent. Lib. 4. diſt. 12.

The next Council therefore under *Gregory* the Seventh waves ſuch offenſive terms, but yet decides the manner of Chriſts Preſence in the Euchariſt as plainly and openly, tho' not in ſuch harſh Expreſſions. Nay they deſigned to explain the *Modus* as deciſively as poſſibly they could, to oblige *Berengarius* to renounce a new way he had of explaining his opinion, which was as *Surius* reports it, that Chriſt's Body is ſubſtantially preſent, but (together with the ſubſtance of the Bread and the Wine, which remain in their Natures unchanged, which is the ſame with the Lutheran Conſubſtantiation. Now this clearly enough expreſſes *Surius* concil. Tom. 3.

the real Presence, and that the Bread and Wine were not mere Signs: and yet this would not do, nothing will serve, but he must declare his Belief of the Real Presence in that manner as they would be pleased to define it. And how that was you may see it in the second form of Abjuration, forc'd on *Berengarius*, (which I have given before) which precisely determines the *Modus* of Christ's Body being present in the Eucharist to be by the change of the Elements into the true and proper Flesh and Blood of Christ. And it was because the Church of *Rome* had thus decreed it to be in this peculiar manner and no other, which made it be received; since many of the Schoolmen plainly avow, that they would rather have embraced Consubstantiation as more Rational, had not the Authority of the Church interposed in defining another manner of Christs substantial Presence. This *Occam* and *Petrus Aliacensis* freely profess: The later of which argues for Consubstantiation, as being less obnoxious to Objections and Absurdities, and easier to be conceived than Transubstantiation, which puts Accidents without a Subject, &c. And therefore he assigns the determination of the Church, as the only reason which sway'd him to assent to this later *Modus* of Christ's Real Presence rather than to the other, which yet he judged in it self to be more Rational.

Occam in lib. Quarto Sen. qu. 5.

Petrus de Alliaco in Quart. lib. sent. qu. 6. Art. 2.

And tho' these Councils did not make use of a hard word which was not invented, yet they as certainly assigned the manner of the thing, as if they had expressed it by Transubstantiation. But that the very Term as well as the Notion might be determined, *Innocent* the Third in a Council, which he assembled in the Lateran at *Rome* in 1215. confines this Article to this peculiar Expression, that those whom they called Hereticks might not, to avoid their Inquisition, conceal their true meaning under cover of general ambiguous Terms. And no word was thought more capable of speaking the manner of the Conversion of the Elements into Christs Body and Blood after Consecration, than this, which says that the one are transubstantiated into the other. And therefore the Decree against the *Albigenses* is compiled in these words.

Spondanus concin. Anali Baron. Tom. 1. ad Annum 1215.

There is one universal Church of the Faithful, out of which none is saved. In which Jesus Christ the Priest is himself the Sacrifice, whose Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Alsar are truly contained under the Species of Bread and and Wine, the Bread being transubstantiated into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood by the Divine Power, that to perfect the Mystery of our Union with him, we may receive that of his, which he assumed

Decretal. Gregor. Lib. 1. de summ. Trinitat. & Fide Catholica. Tit. 1. c. 1.

assumed of ours. What more defining of the signification of the Word the Author of the *Reasons* expects in the Canon of a Council, I cannot imagin, unless he would have had the Fathers to shew themselves good Grammarians in critizing upon Etymologies. For in telling us *that the Body and Blood are truly contained under the Species or Accidents of Bread and Wine, the last being transubstantiated into the first*; they say enough to explain their Meaning to be, that the Substance of the Bread passeth into that of the Body of Christ, which the Council of *Constance* in 1415. clearly explains, when they condemn *Wickliff* as Heretical in his Faith concerning the Eucharist, because forsooth he asserted the *Substance of the Bread and Wine materially to remain in the Sacrament of the Altar, and that the Accidents of the Bread and Wine are not in the same Sacrament without their Subject.* Now this is a Philosophical Disquisition of the manner, which yet the Author says was never decided but in the Schools. Pag. 23

The *Trent* Council is yet more express in defining the *Modus* of the real Presence to be by the Change of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of Christ, which had sufficiently determined Transubstantiation, though they had not added the Word it self, which means no more nor no less than they declare in this whole Sentence, and to prove the contrary, it will be necessary to derive that Word from some other Language than the Latin. But that nothing might be wanting to a full Decision, they appoint this Name Transubstantiation to signifie this Conversion of one Substance into another, and so determine the manner of the thing, as well as explain the meaning of the Word. The Title of the fourth Chapter of their Thirteenth Session, is of Transubstantiation; and it is compo-

Concil. Trid. Sess. 13. c. 4. fed in these Expressions. *Because Christ our Redeemer truly said that to be his Body which he offered under the Species of Bread, therefore the Church of God always were perswaded of this, and this holy Synod now at last declares, that by the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, there is made a Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole Substance of the Wine, into the Substance of his Blood, which Conversion is conveniently and properly called by the holy Catholick Church, Transubstantiation.* By which they appropriate the Word, as full and expressive to signifie the manner how the Body of Christ is really present in the Eucharist. And for this reason it is objected against their Decree in Father *Paolo's* History, that they contradicted themselves. For in the first Chapter of this Session they had said of the manner of the real Presence, yet it could not be expressed, and here they say that Transubstantiation is a most proper and convenient Word, and so undertake to express by it, what before they had said was ineffable. But whose Fault is it, if the Council contradicts it self? *Sforza Pallavicino* in the History of the same Council, which he wrote to destroy, if he could, the established Credit of this great celebrated Historian, endeavours to wipe off this Reproach from the Council: He, and the Author of the *Reasons*, &c. from him, return this Answer unto the Objection; that though the ancient Fathers acknowledged the Procession of the second Person in the Trinity from the Father to be ineffable, and that the Union between God and the Humanity of Christ is ineffable, they yet made use of the words, eternal Generation, and hypostatical Union to express them. 'Tis true, they did so, and yet in a consistency with themselves, which the Council of *Trent* is not. For this first tells us, that Christ is re-

Historia del concilio. Tridentino. Lib. 4

Pallavicino Historia del concili. di Trento. Part. 1. L. 12. c. 7. Pag. 985. Ed. Rom. Pag. 26.

Sess. 13. c. 1.

all

ally and ſubſtantially preſent in the Euchariſt; but that how he is ſo, is inexplicable, and yet in the fourth Chapter, they undertake not only to explain the manner how Chriſts Body is really preſent under the Aceidents of the Bread, which is by the Converſion of the Subſtance of this into that; but they choſe the Word Tranſubſtantiation as moſt accomodate to declare properly this *Modus* of the thing; whereas the ancient Church, becauſe ſhe knew, and had pronounced the Trinity, and the Uniou of the two Natures in Chriſt to be an ineffable Myſtery, never made any Inquiſition how they could be, nor indeed uſed thoſe words of eternal Generation, and hypoſtatical Union with any purpoſe, by them to expreſs the manner of the thing, which yet the *Trent* Council does, as to Tranſubſtatiation, and ſo contradicts its own Decree in the firſt Chapter of this thirteenth Seſſion.

And that the Deſign was particularly to determine the *Modus* of the Real Subſtantial Preſence, to the excluſion of any other, appears from he Canons of the ſame Seſſion: In the Second they pronounce an *Anathema*, againſt al thoſe, who ſhould explain the manner of the Preſence by Conſubſtantiation, tho' that ſalves the ſubſtantial and real Preſence as well as any other; but to believe Chriſt to be really and ſubſtantially preſent in the Euchariſt, was not enough to avoid the imputation of Hereſie; if they do not fully aſſent to the manner how he is there by Tranſubſtantiation, which they had decided, they are as perfectly curs'd as thoſe in the firſt Canon, who affirm'd the Bread and Wine to be naked Signs of Chriſts Body and his Blood. And then in the Third Canon they nicely and Philoſophically dictate, how Chriſt's Body and Blood is contain'd under the *Species*, ſo as to be all under them ſingle, and all in every part of them, which is as ſubtle a Diſquiſition as ever was made by the Schoolmen in any of their Diſputes. Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 13. can. 2.

Pag. 25.

'Tis granted indeed, what our Author would make ſo much of, That when the *Dominicans* and *Franciſcans* fell into Philoſophical Diſputes, they would not be admitted: But their Diſputes were not about the *Modus* of the Real Preſence, which was already ſtrongly confirm'd by the Churches Authority; and all agreed, that it was by Tranſubſtantiation; but they diſagreed, what *Hypotheſis* would be beſt to make it look moſt plauſible. The *Dominicans* were very earneſt to have it, that the Subſtance of the Bread paſſed by an alteration into the Body of Chriſt. The *Franciſcans* were very hot, that the Body of Chriſt was brought into the room of the removed Subſtance of the Bread, which civilly withdrew to give it place. The *Council*, which was always very

very jealous of having its Decrees examin'd or discuss'd by Reasons, in this unintelligible Mystery was sure to be most careful to avoid it; well knowing that Philosophical Notions would but more confound them, and expose the Absurdities, which could not be excus'd, or defended, and they very well knew that sublime Nonsense is most obscure, when wrapt in Clouds, and never becomes more intolerably nauseous than by Endeavours to explain it

And however the Schoolmen might wrangle about a hundred curious Questions concerning the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, yet they all agreed, that the manner of his being there, was by Transubstantiation: This was Matter of Faith, in which they submitted to the Churches Authority; and therefore this was laid as a common Principle conceded by all, though they differed in the manner of their Sophistical Talk about Matter and Form, and the Difference of Accidents from their Subjects, *&c.* And perhaps that which made the Philosophy of *Aristotle* so acceptable, was, because they found it would be most serviceable to Transubstantiation. And therefore the *Cartesian* Philosophy is forbid to be taught in the Schools, because it denies that Accidents are Beings distinct from Substance; and upon these Principles they think Transubstantiation not to be so well deensible. And this is a known Objection which is made use of in the Disputes against him, and which he and his Followers are so studious to evade.

P. 28, The Fourth and last thing which I come now to consider, is, the boasted Consent of the Protestant Churches; where in, says the Author of the *Reasons, &c.* we shall find the same Harmony of the Faith, and Discord of Philosophy as in the Church of *Rome*. But on the contrary, I shall evince, that the Protestants never owned the same Faith of the Real and Substantial Presence with that Church.

The first which he cites, is, the famous *Ausburgh* Confession; wherein yet there is not the least Syllable of the Substantial Presence, but only an express Assertion of the Real, which those whom he calls *Zuinglians* and *Sacramentarians* will not deny in the Sense which I have stated at the beginning of this Discourse. But in the *Latin* Edition, the Author has foisted in these Words, *are there present indeed*: whereas nothing more is expressed, than the Body and Blood of Christ are really exhibited; which all will subscribe to. In the *German* Edition indeed it is worded, *they are truly present*: But if the Author had himself compos'd them, and put in all that he cites them to prove, yet how little evidence to the purpose would they even then give; For all Christendom knows that the *Lutheran* Faith con-

Extat. in corp. confess. par. 2. p. 13.

Apud *Chytræum* Hist. *Aug. Confess.* p. 83. & in. 4to. Tom Oper. *Luth.* Fol. 162. Ed. Germ.

concerning Conſubſtantiation, is vaſtly diſtant from the Subſtantial Preſence, which I prov'd the *Roman* Church in her Councils to have determin'd; and as I have clear'd it by the Fourth Canon of the Thirteenth Seſſion at *Trent*, they are all adjudg'd to be accurs'd Heretics, though they ſpeak out Real and Subſtantial never ſo plain and often, if they do not learn to pronounce another hard Word, which our Author ſays neither can nor ought to be underſtood, and yet it is a Point of their Faith; ſo much is it for their Glory to believe they know not what. I will then grant him that in many of the Proteſtant Confeſſions, Chriſt is ſaid to be really and ſubſtantially preſent; and that *Melancthon* in his Apology for that of *Ausburgh*, chuſes the very Word, out of a Zeal he had to compoſe the Quarrels of Religion, as far as he could without proſtituting Freedom of Conſcience, and the innocence of his Mind. But the effect was very much different from what the good Man hop'd. He did not conſider he had to do with a Church, who profeſſeth it as an Honour due to her infallibility, not to abate the leaſt Punctilio's, which have once had the mark of her Authority. And therefore thoſe of that Church, were ſo far from being courted into any condeſcenſion, by theſe Compliances and Overtures made for Peace, that they became the more haughty and treated the Doctrine of the *Lutherans*, which aſſerted the ſubſtantial Preſence as an inſufferable Hereſy, becauſe they would not expreſs the manner of it to be by Tranſubſtantiation. A clear Inſtance of it, is the Confutation of the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion, preſented and read to the Emperor *Charles* V. and the Princes of *Germany*, wherein it is declared, That the Tenth Article in that Confeſſion concerning the Real and Subſtantial Preſence could not be admitted as ſatisfying, but with this neceſſary addition, *that they believe the the Church determining the Subſtance of the Bread to be changed into the Body of Chriſt in the Conſecration of the Euchariſt, as it was decreed by the General* Lateran *Council under* Innocent *the Third.*

Pag. 9.

Apud chytræum in Hi. Auguſt. confeſſ. pag. 179, 180.

That which farther mamifeſts the ſame thing, is, that in all the Conferences of Religion, between thoſe of the Roman Church, and the Reformers, they could never agree in this Article of the Euchariſt, no more than in any other, but they always quarrel'd that the Proteſtants would not expreſs the manner of this Subſtantial Preſence, as the Romiſh Councils had deliver'd it.

It was this made the Iſſue of a General Diet ſo unſucceſsful, which *Charles* V. convein'd at *Ratesbone* in 1541, with great Zeal and earneſtneſs, to make an accord between the Proteſtants and Catholicks: And he took all politick Meaſurs to bring the two Parties to a con-

a condescending Temper, that by Concessions on both sides, the differences might be accommodated. He influenced the Popes Legate, Cardinal *Contarini*, a Man famous for Wisdom and Learning, and perswaded him, that for the Peace and unity of the Church, he would manage things with a soft and yielding Spirit. The Cardinal was so moderate, as to smooth several Articles which sounded too harsh to the Protestants; and so to qualify the Terms, as to make them be more easily received.

* For this he incurred the Popes high displeasure; † who had given him Instructions not t oabate any thing, and if he saw the Emperor so urgent on him to make healing Concessions that he could not avoid it, he had orders instantly to leave the Diet, tho' not the Court of the Emperour. But he moved more by his own natural Moderation, than the instructions of the Court of *Rome*. And at the Emperor's desire reviewed the Articles of Coucord, which were presented to him by *Granvile* the great Favourite, and Minister of State. He carefully read them over, and corrected them to the mildest and most favourable Expressions. The writing thus form'd as they thought, so that both the contending Parties might agree to it: It was proposed to the Assembly, where the principal deputed to act on behalf of the Catholicks were *Eckius*, *Flugius*, and *Gropperus*, and the Protestants were *Melanthon*, *Bucer*, and *Pistorius*. The Conference at first succeeded very happily, they all consenting in these Articles: viz. *of Faith*, *of Works*, *of Bishops*, *and of Baptism*. But the first subject of Dissention, was (as *Pallavicini* tells us out of the Cardinal's own Letters) the great Controversy of the Eucharist. The *Lutherans*, as high Asserters as they were of the Real Presence, refused the word Transubstantiation. The Cardinal, tho so compliant in other Points, was in this firm and unmoveable, and refused to make the least alteration. And tho' some councelled him to do it, and insinuated to him that it was a meer question about words: yet he had other thoughts, since he apprehended that the rejecting the word, would at last introduce the denial of the thing signified by it. And thus after a Months debate the Conference was broken up, because they could never be brought to a consent in this Atricle.

* Paol. Soave hist. del concil. Trident. lib. 1. p. 103. Ed. 4.

† Pallavicino Historia del Concilio di Trent. part. 1. lib. 11. cap. 13 p. 401.

Pallaric. ibid q. 407.

Sleidanius comment. lib. 14. p. 285. Ed. in fol.

The second Example I shall pruduce is the Conference, which which was in appearance for the same design of Peace, assembled at *Poissy* in *France* in the Year 1561. with as little success. There the great Debate was concerning the Real Presence in the Sacrament. *Peter Martyr*, *Beza*, and *Marlorat* were the most considerable, who managed the Dispute for the Protestants. And here *Beza* was so far from receding

from

from the Confeſſion of their Faith, which four Years before he had preſented at *Worms*, (Though the Author of the *Reaſons, &c.* accuſes him as guilty of a baſe Prevarication.) As on the contrary he freely and plainly profeſſeth *their Faith to be, that the Bread is the Communion of the Body, and the Wine of the Blood of Chriſt, which was ſhed for us, and that in the ſame Subſtance, which he aſſum'd in the Womb of the Virgin*, but yet he renounces Tranſubſtantiation, *as that which contradicts the Truth of Chriſt's Humane Nature, and of his Aſcenſion into Heaven.* And when by the Queen Mothers Command, the Biſhop of *Vallence* and *Deſpencæus* for the Catholicks, and *Beza* and *des Gallares* for the Proteſtants, conſulted together to find an Expedient to accord all Differences as to this Article, they all Four of them at laſt conſented in this Formulary: *We believe that in the uſe of the Lord's Supper, the true Body and Blood of Chriſt is truly, and really, and ſubſtantially; that is, in the Subſtance it ſelf, and in a ſpiritual and ineffable manner is exhibited and taken by the believing Communicants.* Tho' all this was high and expreſſive enough of the reality of Chriſt's Preſence, yet it was not ſatisfactory; the Cardinal ſpoke fiercely againſt it, engag'd the greateſt Party of the Biſhops to decry it as Inſufficient and Heretical, and they ſoon fram'd another contrary, which might import Tranſubſtantiation. And ſo this Conference was diſſolv'd with as little effect as the other, becauſe no other manner of Real Preſence would be admitted, than that which is by the Tranſubſtantiation of the Bread into the Body of Chriſt.

Pag. 53. 54.

Popliniere l' Hiſtoire de France, Tom. 1. l. 7. p. 272.

D'Aubigne l' Hiſtoire Univerſ. Part. 1. l. 2 chap. 24.

Popliniere ibid. p. 274. & d' Aubigne. part. 1. lib. 2. chap. 24.

Thus it fully appears, that tho' theſe Expreſſions of Real and Subſtantial were neceſſarily to be underſtood in their ſtricteſt meaning, when ever us'd in the Confeſſions of Faith, or by *Melanchthon, Bucer, Beza*, &c. yet even by what the Catholicks themſelves have own'd, they do not ſignifie what is the true Faith of their Church, concerning Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt, and ſo are in vain preſs'd by the Author for the Service he deſign'd them.

But the Invalidity of theſe Citations unto this Purpoſe, will enough demonſtrate it ſelf, if we do but examine the true Senſe of theſe words, as they who make uſe of them explain what they meant. 'Tis true indeed that many of the Confeſſions, and among the reſt that of *Wittemberg* in 1536. ſay, *that the Body and Blood of Chriſt are truly and ſubſtantially exhibited.*

ed. But the latter word may be only exegetical of the former, and signifie no more than indeed and in truth, and most real Effects in opposition to meer Notion, and Fancy. For they thought they could not in too lively terms express how far off they were from the opinion of the *German* Anabaptists, who would own the Eucharist to be nothing more than a meer Sign and Memorial of Christ's Death, and to have no other Effect on us, than to put us in mind of it. When therefore the true Orthodox Protestants would obviate these Mistakes, they speak of Christ's Presence in the most amplifying Expressions, as if his Body in its natural Substance were present, and offer'd to us, when as they meant it only in the reality of Grace and Blessing. I will mention but one or two, who to this purpose explain their own sense of the words.

That formulary of Concord which was drawn out of the *Wittemberg* Confession, for the *Helvetian* Churches to Subscribe, and was composed on purpose to soften the harsh sound of some expreffions in that Confession which were offensive. That form of Concord expresseth the Bread to be the Body of Christ only in respect of the Sacramental Union between them, which is the Relation between them as a Sign, and thing signified. And this is subscribed by *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, *Myconius*, *Bucer*, and others. And so for the Saxon Confession which is cited by the Author of the Reasons, *&c.* the words immediately following which he hath omitted, express the Substantial Presence of Christ by the happy Effects. *Christ testifies that he is in them (that is, in the worthy Receivers) and that he makes them Members to himself, and hath washed them with his own Blood.*

Extat apud Chytræum Hist. August. Confes. p. 680.

Pag. 31. 32.

Ibid. p. 511. & Corpus Confess. par. 2. pag. 73.

And *Bucer* himself at his return to *Strasburg* explaining to them the formulary of Concord, explains that word substantially to mean no more than that there is a true Exhibition of Christ himself in the Sacrament.

To produce but one more, which is the Declaration that the Reformed Churches of *Poland*, in an Assembly at *Thorns* made, that *as concerning the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, they assented to the Faith of the Augustan and Bohemian Confessions, which express the substantial Presence.* But then in their special Declaration they explain how they understand it, that the Bread and Wine are truly, and are called so, the

In Corp. Confess. part 2.

Body

Body and Blood, not Substantially, that is, not corporally, but Sacramentally, and Mystically, and the Body and Blood of Christ they speak to be Christ, and his Benefits that are really exhibited and offered to us.

And now to come to our own Church of *England*, she expresses indeed the real Presence, as the Reformed Churches assert it, but not in the sense as 'tis received in the Roman Church for an Article of Faith. *Reasons for Abrogating, &c.* P. 47.

Nor does the Account which the best Historian of this Age gives of *Cranmer* from a Manuscript of the learned Dr. *Stillingfleet*, make that Archbishop a Sacramentarian, as the Author angrily accuses him. For all that *Cranmer*'s Answer recorded in the Manuscript imports, is, only his renouncing a nonsensical Notion of Christ's being offer'd by the Priest as a real Sacrifice to God in the Mass.

To call in question the credit of the Manuscript it self, is to accuse the sincerity of that worthy Person to whom it is owing; and for any Man to question a Reputation so well established, is to forfeit his own. And indeed, by the same reason as he would overthrow the Authority of this Writing, he may that of all Ancient Records in the World, whose Credit depends very much on the Integrity and Learning of him who first produceth them: How he would more have the Paper prov'd and warranted, I cannot imagine, unless he would have the Man who wrote it, conjur'd from the Dead, to be the Authentick Witness. What certain Conveyance of Tradition does he require, unless it is necessary to know the Names of all the Persons from whom it hath been successively delivered. But to know whether a Writing be genuine, our Author has found out a new way of tryals, by examining its Genealogy, and whether it was lawfully begotten, and what were its great Ancestors. And that we may know hereafter what is the legal descent of a writing in Manuscript, the Learned World would be extremely obliged to him, if he would but bless it with the discovery,, how many *Aps* must precisely go to make up the gentile Pedigree of a Paper. But he is so mistrustful of being deceived, that he will believe nothing more than what he sees, which yet is very inconsistent with that Religion, of which he hath so lately undertaken the defence: Pag. 50.

But

But to return to the Argument, all that he brings to prove that the Real and Subſtantial Preſence hath been the conſtant Doctrine of the Church of *England*, is as little convincing as all the former Inſtances he hath aſſigned to prove the ſame of the Foreign Churches.

Page 51. As for the form of words retained in the new Office of the Communion drawn by *Cranmer*, and the Form preſcribed in the firſt Liturgy of *Edward* the Sixth, and that Kings own Injunctions, they expreſs no more than the rankeſt Sacramentarian would do. I am ſure *Peter Martyr*, whom he dignifies with that Title, ſays as much an hundred times.

Page 53. As for the Alteration made in the fifth Year of that King's Reign, the Articles might be as well framed by *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, as by a private Cabal of *Dudleys*, or a Club of poor Laicks. It is a very improbable Calumny, for who can once imagine that a Parliament would ratifie that by a Law, which if it had ſo mean and pitiful a deſcent as he inſinuates, was unworthy the leaſt notice of Authority, unleſs to puniſh the impudent Deceit.

Page 60. But in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, ſays our Author, all this was recalled again; *And ever ſince that time, the moſt eminent Divines in the Church have ſucceſſively, from Age to Age, been the moſt zealous Aſſerters of the Real and Eſſential Preſence.* Ay, but not in the Roman Senſe, and therefore will never come over to his Side.

It would be endleſs to conſider particularly the ſeveral Authors he mentions. Moſt of them may be ſeen in the Hiſtory of Tranſubſtantiation written in Latin by the late learned Biſhop of *Durham*, who cites them for a purpoſe very contrary to his. I will content my ſelf with retorting that Example upon himſelf, which he thinks is moſt ſtrong to ſupport his Aſſertion, and that is *Poinett* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, whoſe Diallacticon was written in 1561. with a deſign of Peace, to reconcile, if poſſibly, all the Differences which this Controverſie of the Euchariſt hath created. He ſays indeed in that Diſcourſe that *the Euchariſt is not only the Figure of the Body of our Lord, but comprehends in it the Truth it ſelf, the Nature and Subſtance* But he requires that we ſhould underſtand this in a ſpiritual Senſe, according to the common and agreeing Interpretation of the ancient Fathers; and what that was is well known, and therefore we cannot be ignorant what was this Learned Biſhop's Mind. I might in like manner ſhew, that tho the other learned Men of this Church, as Biſhop *Jewel*, *Bilſon*, *Andrews*, *Montague*, &c. may on this occaſion have expreſſed themſelves in high and ample terms, yet it was in a different meaning than what the Author of the Reaſons would make us believe they owned.

Coſini Hiſt. Tranſubſt. c. 2.

Thus I have in Zeal for the Truth, which I could not ſee blemiſhed with falſe Shadows without ſome Indignation, employed my poor Abilities to vindicate it. And now I pray God with all my Soul, that the Truth which I would love and value above all things, may not ſuffer any thing from the weakneſs of this Diſcourſe, and that thoſe Diſabilities, of which I am conſcious to my ſelf, may not prejudice the Cauſe which I have attempted to defend.

F I N I S.